

Self-similar solutions with fat tails for Smoluchowski's coagulation equation with singular kernels

B. Niethammer

S. Throm

J. J. L. Velázquez

Institute of Applied Mathematics, University of Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany
 E-mail: niethammer@iam.uni-bonn.de; throm@iam.uni-bonn.de; velazquez@iam.uni-bonn.de

Abstract

We show the existence of self-similar solutions with fat tails for Smoluchowski's coagulation equation for homogeneous kernels satisfying $C_1 (x^{-a}y^b + x^b y^{-a}) \leq K(x, y) \leq C_2 (x^{-a}y^b + x^b y^{-a})$ with $a > 0$ and $b < 1$. This covers especially the case of Smoluchowski's classical kernel $K(x, y) = (x^{1/3} + y^{1/3})(x^{-1/3} + y^{-1/3})$.

For the proof of existence we first consider some regularized kernel K_ε for which we construct a sequence of solutions h_ε . In a second step we pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to obtain a solution for the original kernel K . The main difficulty is to establish a uniform lower bound on h_ε . The basic idea for this is to consider the time-dependent problem and choosing a special test function that solves the dual problem.

1 Introduction

1.1 Smoluchowski's equation and self-similarity

Smoluchowski's coagulation equation [13] describes irreversible aggregation of clusters through binary collisions by a mean-field model for the density $f(\xi, t)$ of clusters of mass ξ . It is assumed that the rate of coagulation of clusters of size ξ and η is given by a rate kernel $K = K(\xi, \eta)$, such that the evolution of f is determined by

$$\partial_t f(\xi, t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\xi K(\xi - \eta, \eta) f(\xi - \eta, t) f(\eta, t) d\eta - f(\xi, t) \int_0^\infty K(\xi, \eta) f(\eta, t) d\eta. \quad (1)$$

Applications in which this model has been used are numerous and include, for example, aerosol physics, polymerization, astrophysics and mathematical biology (see e.g. [1, 3]).

A topic of particular interest in the theory of coagulation is the scaling hypothesis on the long-time behaviour of solutions to (1). Indeed, for homogeneous kernels one expects that solutions converge to a uniquely determined self-similar profile. This issue is however only well-understood for the solvable kernels $K(x, y) = 2$, $K(x, y) = x + y$ and $K(x, y) = xy$. In these cases it is known that (1) has one fast-decaying self-similar solution with finite mass and a family of so-called fat-tail self-similar solutions with power-law decay. Furthermore, their domains of attraction under the evolution (1) have been completely characterized in [9]. For non-solvable kernels much less is known and it is exclusively for the case $\gamma < 1$. In [5, 6] existence of self-similar solutions with finite mass has been established for a large range of kernels and some properties of those solutions have been investigated in [2, 4, 7]. More recently, the first existence results of self-similar solutions with fat tails have been proved, first for the diagonal kernel [10], then for kernels that are bounded by $C(x^\gamma + y^\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ [11]. It is the goal of this paper to extend the results in [11] to singular kernels, such as Smoluchowski's classical kernel $K(x, y) = (x^{1/3} + y^{1/3})(x^{-1/3} + y^{-1/3})$. Uniqueness of solutions with both, finite and infinite mass is still one of the main problems for non-solvable kernels and in most cases an open question. Only recently uniqueness has been shown in the finite mass case for kernels that are in some sense close to the constant kernel [12].

In order to describe our results in more detail, we first derive the equation for self-similar solutions. Such solutions to (1) for kernels of homogeneity $\gamma < 1$ are of the form

$$f(\xi, t) = \frac{\beta}{t^\alpha} g(x), \quad \alpha = 1 + (1+\gamma)\beta, \quad x = \frac{\xi}{t^\beta} \quad (2)$$

where the self-similar profile g solves

$$-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}g - xg'(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^x K(x-y, y)g(x-y)g(y)dy - g(x) \int_0^\infty K(x, y)g(y)dy. \quad (3)$$

It is known that for some kernels the self-similar profiles are singular at the origin, so that the integrals on the right-hand side are not finite and it is necessary to rewrite the equation in a weaker form. Multiplying the equation by x and rearranging we obtain that a weak self-similar solution g solves

$$\partial_x(x^2 g(x)) = \partial_x \left[\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty yK(y, z)g(z)g(y) dz dy \right] + \left((1-\gamma) - \frac{1}{\beta} \right) xg(x) \quad (4)$$

in a distributional sense. If one in addition requires that the solution has finite first moment, then this also fixes $\beta = 1/(1-\gamma)$ and in this case the second term on the right hand side of (4) vanishes.

For the following it is convenient to go over to the monomer density function $h(x, t) = xg(x, t)$ and to introduce the parameter $\rho = \gamma + \frac{1}{\beta}$. Then equation (4) becomes

$$\partial_x \left[\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z)}{z} h(z) h(y) dz dy \right] - [\partial_x(xh) + (\rho - 1)h](x) = 0. \quad (5)$$

Our approach to find a solution to (5) requires to work with the corresponding evolution equation. Using as new time variable $\log(t)$ which will be denoted as t from now on, the time dependent version of equation (5) becomes

$$\partial_t h(x, t) + \partial_x \left[\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z)}{z} h(z, t) h(y, t) dz dy \right] - [\partial_x(xh) + (\rho - 1)h](x, t) = 0, \quad (6)$$

with initial data

$$h(x, 0) = h_0(x). \quad (7)$$

1.2 Assumptions on the kernel and main result

We now formulate our assumptions on the kernel K . We assume that

$$K \in C^1((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)), \quad K(x, y) = K(y, x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in (0, \infty), \quad (8)$$

K is homogeneous of degree $\gamma \in (-\infty, 1)$, that is

$$K(\lambda x, \lambda y) = \lambda^\gamma K(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in (0, \infty), \quad (9)$$

and satisfies the growth condition

$$C_1 (x^{-a}y^b + x^b y^{-a}) \leq K(x, y) \leq C_2 (x^{-a}y^b + x^b y^{-a}) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in (0, \infty), \quad (10)$$

where $a > 0$, $b < 1$, $\gamma = b - a$, and C_1, C_2 are positive constants. Furthermore we assume the following locally uniform bound on the partial derivative: for each interval $[d, D] \subset (0, \infty)$ there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(d, D) > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_x K(x, y)| \leq C_3 (y^{-a} + y^b) \quad \text{for all } x \in [d, D] \text{ and } y \in (0, \infty). \quad (11)$$

Let us first discuss what we can expect on the possible decay behaviours of self-similar solutions. If $h(x) \sim Cx^{-\rho}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, then in order for $\int_1^\infty \frac{K(x,y)}{y} h(y) dy < \infty$ we need

$$\rho > b = \gamma + a \quad \text{and} \quad \rho + a > 0. \quad (12)$$

Note that since γ can be negative, $-a$ can be larger than b . Furthermore we need to assume that $b < 1$ since for $b > 1$ we could have instantaneous gelation and $b = 1$ is a borderline case that can also not be treated with our methods. The same assumption has also been made in related work, where, for example in [2], regularity of self-similar solutions with finite mass have been investigated. In addition it will turn out later that we have to assume $\rho > 0$ (see: Lemma 3.10).

Our main result can now be formulated as follows

Theorem 1.1. *Let K be a kernel that satisfies assumptions (8)-(11) for some $b \in (-\infty, 1)$ and $a > 0$. Then for any $\rho \in (\max(-a, b, 0), 1) = (\max(b, 0), 1)$ there exists a non-negative measure $h \in \mathcal{M}([0, \infty))$ that solves (5) in the sense of distributions. This solution decays in the expected manner in an averaged sense, i.e. it satisfies $\int_{[0, R]} h dx \leq R^{1-\rho}$ for all $R > 0$ and for each $\delta > 0$ there exists $R_\delta > 0$ such that*

$$(1 - \delta) R^{1-\rho} \leq \int_{[0, R]} h dx \quad \text{for all } R \geq R_\delta,$$

which together implies $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{1-\rho}} \int_{[0, R]} h dx = 1$.

Remark 1.2. One can in fact show that under the assumptions (8)-(11) the measure h has a continuous density and satisfies $h(r) \sim (1 - \rho)r^{-\rho}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. This has been proved in the case of locally bounded kernels in [11] and the proof in the present case proceeds similarly. Furthermore, if K is more regular, one can also establish higher regularity of h in $(0, \infty)$. In order to keep the present paper within a reasonable length we will give the corresponding proofs in a subsequent separate paper.

1.3 Strategy of the proof

The proof of Theorem 1.1 consists of two main parts. In the first one which is contained in Section 2 we shift the singularities of the kernel by some $\varepsilon > 0$ to get a kernel K_ε that is bounded at the origin. The idea is then to prove Theorem 1.1 with this modified kernel to get a solution h_ε . The proof follows the one in [11], i.e. the existence of a stationary solution to (6) is shown by using the following variant of Tikhonov's fixed point theorem.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 1.2 in [5, 8]). *Let X be a Banach space and $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous semi-group on X . Assume that S_t is weakly sequentially continuous for any $t > 0$ and that there exists a subset $\mathcal{Y}$ of X that is nonempty, convex, weakly sequentially compact and invariant under the action of S_t . Then there exists $z_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ which is stationary under the action of S_t .*

As most of the estimates from [11] remain valid for the shifted kernel K_ε we only state the main definitions and results and refer to [11] for the proofs. The only exception is the invariance of some lower bound defining the set $\mathcal{Y}$ from Theorem 1.3. As this step cannot just be transferred to the present situation we will give the full proof of this. The main idea here is to construct a special test function that solves the dual problem, for which one can derive some lower bounds that are sufficient to obtain the invariance (Section 2.5.1).

In the second part which is contained in Section 3 we have to remove the shift in K_ε , i.e we have to take the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The strategy here is similar to what is done in the first part as one of the main difficulties consists in showing a suitable lower bound (uniform in ε) for h_ε (Section 3.2.3). This will again be done by constructing a suitable test function by solving the dual problem for which we get adequate estimates from below (Section 3.2.1). One difficulty then is to show that the functions h_ε obtained before decay sufficiently rapidly at the origin as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (Section 3.4). In fact we will get some exponential decay that will be enough to pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (Section 3.5).

The proofs of the existence of the solutions to the dual problems as well as some basic properties and estimates frequently used are contained in the appendix.

2 Stationary solutions for the kernel K_ε

In this section we let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed and consider the kernel

$$K_\varepsilon(y, z) := K(y + \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon).$$

We prove the following Proposition:

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\rho \in (\max(b, 0), 1)$ there exists a continuous function $h_\varepsilon: (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that is a weak solution to (5) with K replaced by K_ε . This solution satisfies*

$$\int_0^r h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq r^{1-\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^r h_\varepsilon(x) dx}{r^{1-\rho}} = 1.$$

2.1 Plan of the construction for h_ε

The proof of Proposition 2.1 follows closely the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [11]. As the estimates remain in principle the same here we just recall the strategy of the proof and state the main definitions and results while for proofs we refer to [11]. The only modification we have to establish, compared to [11], is the proof of the invariance of some lower bound that cannot just easily be adapted and we will show this in Section 2.5.

The strategy to find a solution to (5) (with K replaced by K_ε) will be to show that the evolution given by (6) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 (notice that it suffices that the respective properties hold in a possibly small time interval $[0, T]$). One key point in the application of this theorem is obviously an appropriate choice of X and $\mathcal{Y}$. Here we use for X the set of measures on $[0, \infty)$ and as $\mathcal{Y}$ the set of non-negative measures which satisfy the expected decay behaviour in an averaged sense (cf. Definition 2.4). As well-posedness of (6) is not so easy to show for K_ε directly we introduce a regularized problem where we cut the kernel K_ε (in a smooth way) for small and large cluster sizes in the following way: for $\lambda > 0$ we consider

$$\begin{aligned} K_\varepsilon^\lambda(x, y) &= K_\varepsilon(x, y), \quad \text{if } \lambda \leq \min\{x, y\} \text{ and } \max\{x, y\} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}, \\ K_\varepsilon^\lambda(x, y) &= 0, \quad \text{if } \min\{x, y\} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \text{ and } \max\{x, y\} \geq \frac{3}{2\lambda}, \\ K_\varepsilon^\lambda &\leq K_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Remark 2.2. Note that in [11] a slightly different cutoff was used but this does not cause any problem.

In the rest of this section we assume that in all equations the kernel K is replaced by K_ε^λ (or later by K_ε when we take the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$).

We are now going to prove the well-posedness of (6) for the kernel K_ε^λ with $\lambda > 0$. We will consider the set of non-negative Radon measures that we will denote with some abuse of notation by $h(x) dx$ and such that the norm defined in (14) is finite. We notice that this implies that $h dx$ does not contain a Dirac at the origin. Since, however, $h dx$ might contain Dirac measures away from the origin, we use the convention that integrals such as $\int_a^b h(x) dx$ are always understood in the sense $\int_{[a, b]} h(x) dx$.

Definition 2.3. Given $\rho \in (\max\{0, b\}, 1)$ with b as in Assumption (10), we will denote as $\mathcal{X}_\rho$ the set of measures $h \in \mathcal{M}_+([0, \infty))$ such that

$$\|h\| := \sup_{R \geq 0} \frac{\int_{[0, R]} h(x) dx}{R^{1-\rho}} < \infty. \tag{14}$$

We introduce a suitable topology in $\mathcal{X}_\rho$. We define the neighbourhoods of $h_* \in \mathcal{X}_\rho$ by means of the intersections of sets of the form

$$\mathcal{N}_{\phi, \epsilon} := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{X}_\rho : \left| \int_{[0, \infty)} (h - h_*) \phi dx \right| < \epsilon \right\}, \quad \phi \in C_c([0, \infty)), \quad \epsilon > 0. \tag{15}$$

We now define the subset $\mathcal{Y}$, for which we will show that it remains invariant under the evolution defined by (6).

Definition 2.4. Given $R_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ we will denote by $\mathcal{Y}$ the family of measures $h \in \mathcal{X}_\rho$ satisfying the following inequalities

$$\int_{[0,r]} h dx \leq r^{1-\rho}, \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

$$\int_{[0,r]} h dx \geq r^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \frac{R_0^\delta}{r^\delta}\right)_+ \quad \text{for all } r > 0. \quad (17)$$

Remark 2.5. We will not make the dependence of $\mathcal{Y}$ on the variables R_0 and δ explicit.

We then easily see that

Lemma 2.6. *The sets $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{X}_\rho$ defined in Definition 2.4 are weakly sequentially compact.*

2.2 Well-posedness of the evolution equation

We first have to make sure that the evolution equation (6)-(7) with K replaced by K_ε^λ as in (13) is well-posed. We are going to construct first a mild solution of (6). For that purpose we introduce the rescaling

$$X = xe^t, \quad h(x, t) = H(X, t) \quad (18)$$

and get

$$\partial_t H(X, t) - \rho H(X, t) + \partial_X \left[\int_0^X \int_{X-Y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Ye^{-t}, Ze^{-t})}{Z} H(Z, t) H(Y, t) dZ dY \right] = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$H(X, 0) = h_0(X). \quad (20)$$

Expanding the derivative ∂_X we find that (19) is equivalent to

$$\partial_t H(X, t) + (\mathcal{A}[H](X, t)) H(X, t) - \mathcal{Q}[H](X, t) = 0 \quad (21)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}[H](X, t) &:= \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Xe^{-t}, Ye^{-t})}{Y} H(Y, t) dY - \rho \\ \mathcal{Q}[H](X, t) &:= \int_0^X \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Ye^{-t}, (X-Y)e^{-t})}{X-Y} H(X-Y, t) H(Y, t) dY. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.7. We will say that a function $H \in C([0, T], \mathcal{X}_\rho)$ is a mild solution of equation (21) if the following identity holds in the sense of measures

$$H(\cdot, t) = \mathcal{T}[H] \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}[H](X, t) &= \exp\left(-\int_0^t \mathcal{A}[H](X, s) ds\right) h_0(X) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \exp\left(-\int_s^t \mathcal{A}[H](X, \tau) d\tau\right) \mathcal{Q}H(X, s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

For this notion of solutions we have the following existence result that follows by the contraction mapping principle.

Theorem 2.8. *Let K satisfy Assumptions (8)-(10) and let K_ε^λ be as in (13) for $\lambda > 0$. Then there exists $T > 0$ such that there exists a unique mild solution of (21) in $(0, T)$ in the sense of Definition 2.7.*

We furthermore introduce weak solutions in the following sense:

Definition 2.9. We say that $h \in C([0, T], \mathcal{X}_\rho)$ is a weak solution of (6), (7) if for any $t \in [0, T]$ and any test function $\psi \in C_c^1([0, \infty) \times [0, t])$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty h(x, t) \psi(x, t) dx - \int_0^\infty h_0(x) \psi(x, 0) dx - \int_0^t \left[\int_0^\infty \partial_s \psi(x, s) h(x, s) dx \right] ds \\ & + \int_0^t \left[\int_0^\infty \psi(x, s) \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(x, z)}{z} h(z, s) dz h(x, s) dx \right] ds \\ & - \int_0^t \left[\int_0^\infty \psi(x, s) \int_0^x \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(y, x-y)}{x-y} h(x-y, s) h(y, s) dy dx \right] ds \\ & + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty x h(x, s) \partial_x \psi(x, s) dx ds - (\rho - 1) \int_0^t \int_0^\infty h(x, s) \psi(x, s) dx ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By changing variables one obtains the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. Suppose $H \in C([0, T], \mathcal{X}_\rho)$ is a mild solution of (6),(7) in the sense of Definition 2.7. Then h is a weak solution in the sense of Definition 2.9.

2.3 Weak continuity of the evolution semi-group

We denote the value of the mild solution h of (6)-(7) obtained in Theorem 2.8 with initial data h_0 as

$$h(x, t) = S_\varepsilon^\lambda(t) h_0(x), \quad t > 0. \quad (25)$$

Note that $S_\varepsilon^\lambda(t)$ defines a mapping from $\mathcal{X}_\rho$ to itself. We also define the transformation that brings $h_0(x)$ to $H(X, t)$ which solves (19), (20) and whose existence is given by Theorem 2.8. We will write

$$H(X, t) = T_\varepsilon^\lambda(t) h_0, \quad t > 0. \quad (26)$$

With this notation we can state the following Proposition giving the weak continuity of the evolution semi-group:

Proposition 2.11. The transformation $S_\varepsilon^\lambda(t)$ defined by means of (25) for any $t \in [0, T]$ is a continuous map from $\mathcal{X}_\rho$ into itself if $\mathcal{X}_\rho$ is endowed with the topology defined by means of the functionals (15).

Remark 2.12. The continuity that we obtain is not uniform in λ .

The idea to prove this is to use a special test function in the definition of weak solutions. As the transformation (18) is continuous in the weak topology it suffices to show that T_ε^λ is continuous. Since it is not linear it is not enough to check continuity at $h_0 = 0$. More precisely fix $t \in [0, T]$ and consider a test function $\bar{\Psi}(X)$ with $\bar{\Psi} \in C_c([0, \infty))$. Suppose that we have H_1, H_2 such that $T_\varepsilon^\lambda h_{0,i} = H_i(\cdot, t)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Using the definition of weak solutions and taking the difference of the corresponding equations we obtain after some manipulations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty (H_1(X, t) - H_2(X, t)) \bar{\Psi}(X, t) dX - \int_0^\infty (h_{0,1}(X) - h_{0,2}(X)) \bar{\Psi}(X, 0) dX \\ & = \int_0^t \int_0^\infty (H_1(X, s) - H_2(X, s)) [\partial_s \bar{\Psi} - \mathcal{T}[\bar{\Psi}]](X, s) dX ds \end{aligned}$$

Thus choosing the test function $\bar{\Psi}$ in some suitable function space such that $\partial_s \bar{\Psi} - \mathcal{T}[\bar{\Psi}] = 0$ and $\bar{\Psi}(\cdot, t) = \bar{\Psi}$ the claim follows (for more details see [11, Proposition 2.8]).

2.4 Recovering the upper estimate - Conservation of (16)

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that $h_0 \in \mathcal{X}_\rho$ satisfies (16). Let $h(x, t)$ be as in (25). Then $h(\cdot, t)$ satisfies (16) as well.*

This follows in the same way as in [11, Proposition 3.1] by integrating (19) and changing variables.

2.5 Recovering the lower estimate - Conservation of (17)

The invariance of the lower bound will be shown in several steps. First we choose a special test function in the definition of weak solutions, more precisely the solution of the corresponding dual problem. Next we derive suitable lower bounds and integral estimates for this function. Finally we show the invariance of (17).

2.5.1 The dual problem

In Definition 2.9 of weak solutions we choose ψ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^t \int_{[0, \infty)} \partial_s \psi(x, s) h(x, s) dx ds \\ & - \int_0^t \int_{[0, \infty)} \psi(x, s) \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(x, z)}{z} h(z, s) dz h(x, s) dx ds \\ & - \int_0^t \int_{[0, \infty)} \psi(x, s) \int_0^x \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(y, x-y)}{x-y} h(x-y, s) h(y, s) dy dx ds \\ & + \int_0^t \int_{[0, \infty)} x h(x, s) \partial_x \psi(x, s) dx ds - (\rho - 1) \int_0^t \int_{[0, \infty)} h(x, s) \psi(x, s) dx ds \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and thus obtain

$$\int_{[0, \infty)} h(x, t) \psi(x, t) dx - \int_{[0, \infty)} h_0(x) \psi(x, 0) dx \geq 0. \quad (28)$$

After some rearrangement we find that (27) is satisfied if ψ solves the dual problem

$$\partial_s \psi(x, s) + \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(x, z)}{z} h(z, s) [\psi(x+z, s) - \psi(x, s)] dz - x \partial_x \psi(x, s) - (1 - \rho) \psi(x, s) \geq 0 \quad (29)$$

together with some suitable initial condition $\psi(x, t) = \psi_0(x)$.

With regard to (28), the idea to estimate $\int_0^R h(x, t) dx$ is to take ψ_0 as a smoothed version of $\chi_{(-\infty, R]}$ and to estimate $\psi(\cdot, 0)$ from below. Using then that (17) holds for h_0 this will be enough to show that this estimate is conserved under the action of S_ε^λ . Rescaling $X := xe^{s-t}$ and $\psi(x, s) = e^{-(1-\rho)(t-s)} \Phi(xe^{s-t}, s)$ we find after some elementary computations that equation (29) together with the initial condition is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \Phi(X, s) + \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Xe^{t-s}, Ze^{t-s})}{Z} h(Ze^{t-s}) [\Phi(X+Z, s) - \Phi(X, s)] dZ & \geq 0 \\ \Phi(X, t) & = \psi_0(X). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

This is (the rescaled version of) the dual problem.

Remark 2.14. Note that for applying Theorem 1.3 we only need the assumptions on a small interval $[0, T]$. So we may assume in the following that $T < 1$ is sufficiently small.

2.5.2 Construction of a solution to the dual problem

In the following we always assume without loss of generality that $\varepsilon \leq 1$ and $R_0 \geq 1$ (and thus we may also assume $R \geq 1$). For $0 < \kappa < 1$ we furthermore denote by φ_κ a non-negative, symmetric standard mollifier such that $\text{supp } \varphi_\kappa \subset [-\kappa, \kappa]$.

The idea to construct a solution Φ to the dual problem is to replace the solution h and the integral kernel K_ε^λ in (30) by corresponding power laws (using (10)) multiplied by a sufficiently large constant and estimating the powers of X using $X \in [0, R]$. We therefore choose Φ as a solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \Phi(X, s) + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_1(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X+Z) - \Phi(X)] dZ \\ + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_2(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X+Z) - \Phi(X)] dZ = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

with initial condition $\Phi(X, t) = \chi_{(-\infty, R-\kappa]} *^2 \varphi_{\kappa/2}(X)$ and $C_0 > 0$ to be fixed later and $\tilde{v}_i(Z) := Z^{-\omega_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$, with $\omega_1 = \min\{\rho - b, \rho\}$ and $\omega_2 = \rho$. Here $*^n$ denotes the n -fold convolution.

Lemma 2.15. *There exists a solution Φ of (31) in $C^1([0, t], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$.*

Proof. This is shown in Proposition B.8. $\square$

We furthermore define $G(X, s) := -\partial_X \Phi(X, s)$ and $\tilde{G}$ by $G(X, s) = \frac{1}{R} \tilde{G}(\frac{X}{R} - 1 + \frac{\kappa}{R}, s)$. Then $\tilde{G}$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \tilde{G}(\xi, s) + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_1(R\eta)}{\eta} [\tilde{G}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{G}(\xi)] d\eta \\ + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_2(R\eta)}{\eta} [\tilde{G}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{G}(\xi)] d\eta = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with initial datum $\tilde{G}(\cdot, t) = \delta(\cdot) *^2 \varphi_{\frac{\kappa}{2R}}$. We also summarize the following properties for Φ and $\tilde{G}$ given by Remark B.9 and the choice of the initial condition:

Remark 2.16. The function $\Phi(\cdot, s)$ given by Lemma 2.15 is non-increasing for all $s \in [0, t]$ and satisfies:

$$0 \leq \Phi(\cdot, s) \leq 1, \quad \text{supp } \Phi(\cdot, s) \subset (-\infty, R] \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, t] \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(X, t) = 1 \text{ for all } X \in (-\infty, R - 2\kappa].$$

Furthermore $\tilde{G}$ is non-negative and satisfies

$$\text{supp } \tilde{G}(\cdot, s) \subset (-\infty, \kappa/R] \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{G}(\xi, s) d\xi = 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, t].$$

The following Lemma states the two integral bounds that will be the key in proving the invariance of (17):

Lemma 2.17. *There exist $\omega, \theta \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $D > 0$ we have*

1. $\int_{-\infty}^{-D} \tilde{G}(\xi, s) d\xi \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{RD}\right)^\mu + \frac{Ct}{D^\omega} R^{-\theta},$
2. $\int_{-1}^0 |\xi| \tilde{G}(\xi, s) d\xi \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{R}\right)^\mu + Ct R^{-\theta}.$

Proof of Lemma 2.17. From the proof of Proposition B.8 we have that $\tilde{G}$ is given as $\tilde{G} = \tilde{G}_1 * \tilde{G}_2$ where $\tilde{G}_1$ and $\tilde{G}_2$ solve

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \tilde{G}_1(\xi, s) + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_1(R\eta)}{\eta} [\tilde{G}_1(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{G}_1(\xi)] d\eta = 0 \\ \partial_s \tilde{G}_2(\xi, s) + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_2(R\eta)}{\eta} [\tilde{G}_2(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{G}_2(\xi)] d\eta = 0 \end{aligned}$$

with initial data $\tilde{G}_1(\cdot, t) = \tilde{G}_2(\cdot, t) = \varphi_{\frac{\kappa}{2R}}$. Then one has from Lemma B.11:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{-D} \tilde{G}(\xi, s) d\xi \leq \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2} \tilde{G}_1(\xi, s) d\xi + \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2} \tilde{G}_2(\xi, s) d\xi$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1}^0 |\xi| \tilde{G}(\xi, s) d\xi &\leq \int_{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2R}}^{\frac{\kappa}{2R}} |\xi| \tilde{G}_1(\xi, s) d\xi + \int_{-1-\frac{\kappa}{2R}}^{\frac{\kappa}{2R}} |\xi| \tilde{G}_2(\xi, s) d\xi \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa}{R} + \int_{-2}^0 |\xi| \tilde{G}_1(\xi, s) d\xi + \int_{-2}^0 |\xi| \tilde{G}_2(\xi, s) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma B.10 we obtain with

$$N_1(\eta) = C(\varepsilon) R^{-\omega_1} \eta^{-1-\omega_1}, \quad N_2(\eta) = C(\varepsilon) [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] R^{-\omega_2} \eta^{-1-\omega_2}$$

the appropriate estimates for $\tilde{G}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ with ω_i for $i = 1, 2$ and $\theta_1 = \omega_1$, $\theta_2 = \min\{\omega_2, b - \omega_2\}$. Thus the claim follows by setting $\theta := \min\{\omega_1, \omega_2, b - \omega_2\}$ and $\omega := \min\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and using also that $\frac{\kappa}{R} \leq (\frac{\kappa}{R})^\mu$ for $\kappa \leq 1$ and $R \geq 1$ for the second statement. $\square$

Lemma 2.18. *For sufficiently large C_0 the function Φ satisfies (30).*

Proof. We have to show that for $X \in [0, R]$ we have

$$\partial_s \Phi(X, s) + \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Xe^{t-s}, Ze^{t-s})}{Z} e^{\frac{s}{\beta}} h(Ze^{t-s}, s) [\Phi(X+Z, s) - \Phi(X, s)] dZ \geq 0.$$

By construction of Φ this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &-C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_1(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X+Z) - \Phi(X)] dZ \\ &-C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_2(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X+Z) - \Phi(X)] dZ \\ &+ \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Xe^{t-s}, Ze^{t-s})}{Z} e^{\frac{s}{\beta}} h(Ze^{t-s}) [\Phi(X+Z) - \Phi(X)] dZ \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Estimating K_ε^λ for $X \in [0, R]$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K_\varepsilon^\lambda(Xe^{t-s}, Ze^{t-s})}{Z} e^{\frac{s}{\beta}} &\leq C \frac{(Xe^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^{-a} (Ze^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^b + (Xe^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^b (Ze^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{Z} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^{-a} \frac{(Ze^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^b}{Z} + C \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\} \frac{(Ze^{t-s} + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{Z} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{1, \varepsilon^b\} (Z^{-1} \chi_{[0,1]}(Z) + Z^{b-1} \chi_{[1,\infty)}(Z)) + C \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\} \varepsilon^{-a} Z^{-1} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] Z^{-1} + C \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{1, \varepsilon^b\} Z^{\max\{0, b\}-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$w_1(Z) := \frac{h(Ze^{t-s})}{Z^{1-\max\{0, b\}}} \quad \text{and} \quad w_2(Z) := \frac{h(Ze^{t-s})}{Z}$$

and using that Φ is non-increasing it thus suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_1(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \\
& + C_0 \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{v}_2(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \\
& - C \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{1, \varepsilon^b\} \int_0^\infty \frac{w_1(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \\
& - C \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty \frac{w_2(Z)}{Z} [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$V_i(Z) := \int_Z^\infty \frac{v_i(Y)}{Y} dY \quad \text{and} \quad W_i(Z) := \int_Z^\infty \frac{w_i(Y)}{Y} dY$$

we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty -\partial_Z (C_0 V_1(Z) - C W_1(Z)) [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \\
& + \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty -\partial_Z (C_0 V_2(Z) - C W_2(Z)) [\Phi(X) - \Phi(X+Z)] dZ \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{-a} \max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} \int_0^\infty -\partial_Z \Phi(X+Z) (C_0 V_1(Z) - C W_1(Z)) dZ \\
& + \varepsilon^{-a} [\max\{\varepsilon^b, 1\} + \max\{\varepsilon^b, R^b\}] \int_0^\infty -\partial_Z \Phi(X+Z) (C_0 V_2(Z) - C W_2(Z)) dZ \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Using that Φ is non-increasing it thus suffices to show $C_0 V_i(Z) - C W_i(Z) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. To see this note first that V_i is explicitly given by $V_i(Z) = \frac{1}{\omega_i} Z^{-\omega_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Furthermore using Lemma A.1 one has

$$W_1(Z) \leq C Z^{\max\{0, b\} - \rho} = C Z^{-\omega_1} \quad \text{and} \quad W_2(Z) \leq C Z^{-\omega_2}.$$

Thus choosing C_0 sufficiently large the claim follows. $\square$

We finally prove a technical Lemma that will be needed in the following.

Lemma 2.19. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\rho \in (\max\{0, b\}, 1)$. Then*

$$\left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi\right)^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta \frac{e^{-\delta t}}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta}\right) \geq \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta e^{-\delta t}\right) - \left|\xi - \frac{\kappa}{R}\right|$$

holds for every $\xi \in [\frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} - 1 + \frac{\kappa}{R}, \frac{\kappa}{R}]$.

Proof. Let $\frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} - 1 + \frac{\kappa}{R} \leq \xi \leq \frac{\kappa}{R}$, then $(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi) \in [\frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t}, 1]$. Thus for $0 \leq \rho < 1$ we have $(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^{1-\rho} \geq (1 - |\xi - \frac{\kappa}{R}|)$ and therefore we can estimate (noting that the second term in brackets is non-negative)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi\right)^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta \frac{e^{-\delta t}}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi\right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta \frac{e^{-\delta t}}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta}\right) \\
& = 1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \frac{1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} - \left|\xi - \frac{\kappa}{R}\right|
\end{aligned}$$

as $\frac{1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta} \leq 1$ for ξ as above and $\delta < 1$. $\square$

2.5.3 Invariance of the lower bound

We are now prepared to finish the proof of the invariance of the lower bound (17).

Proposition 2.20. *For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large R_0 (maybe also depending on δ), we have*

$$\int_0^R h(x, t) dx \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \right)_+.$$

Proof. From the special choice of the test function ψ we have according to (28) that

$$\int_0^R h(x, t) dx \geq \int_0^\infty h(x, t) \psi(x, t) dx \geq \int_0^\infty h_0(x) \psi(x, 0) dx = e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty h_0(Xe^t) \Phi(X, 0) e^t dX.$$

Defining $H_0(X) := \int_0^X h_0(Y) dY$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^R h(x, t) &\geq e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty h_0(Xe^t) \Phi(X, 0) e^t dX = e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty H_0'(Xe^t) \Phi(X, 0) dX \\ &= e^{-(1-\rho)t} H_0(Xe^t) \Phi(X, 0) \Big|_0^\infty + e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty H_0(Xe^t) (-\partial_X \Phi(X, 0)) dX \\ &= e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty H_0(Xe^t) (-\partial_X \Phi(X, 0)) dX \end{aligned}$$

where we integrated by parts and used that the boundary terms are zero as $H(0) = 0$ and the support of Φ is bounded from the right. Using now that by assumption we have $H_0(Xe^t) \geq (Xe^t)^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{Xe^t} \right)^\delta \right)_+$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^R h(x, t) dx &\geq e^{-(1-\rho)t} \int_0^\infty (Xe^t)^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{Xe^t} \right)^\delta \right)_+ G(X, 0) dX \\ &= \int_0^\infty X^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{Xe^t} \right)^\delta \right)_+ \frac{1}{R} \tilde{G}\left(\frac{X}{R} - 1 + \frac{\kappa}{R}, 0\right) dX \\ &= R^{1-\rho} \int_{-D}^{\kappa/R} \left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi \right)^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \frac{e^{-\delta t}}{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{R} + \xi)^\delta} \right) \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

where we used the change of variables $\xi = \frac{X}{R} - 1 + \frac{\kappa}{R}$ and defined $D := 1 - \frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} - \frac{\kappa}{R}$. Note that for $\kappa \leq (1 - e^{-t})$ we have $0 \leq D \leq 1$ (because we assume $R \geq 1$). Using Lemma 2.19 we can estimate the integrand on the right hand side to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^R h(x, t) dx &\geq R^{1-\rho} \int_{-D}^{\kappa/R} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi - R^{1-\rho} \int_{-D}^{\kappa/R} \left| \xi - \frac{\kappa}{R} \right| \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi \\ &\geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\kappa/R} \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi - \int_{-\infty}^{-D} \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi \right) \\ &\quad - R^{1-\rho} \left(\int_{-1}^0 \left| \xi - \frac{\kappa}{R} \right| \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi + \frac{\kappa}{R} \int_0^{\kappa/R} \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi \right) \end{aligned}$$

Applying furthermore Remark 2.16 and Lemma 2.17 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^R h(x, t) dx \\
& \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) \left(1 - C \left(\frac{\kappa}{RD} \right)^\mu - \frac{C}{D^\omega} R^{-\theta} \right) \\
& \quad - R^{1-\rho} \left(\int_{-1}^0 |\xi| \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi + \frac{\kappa}{R} \int_{-1}^0 \tilde{G}(\xi, 0) d\xi + \frac{\kappa}{R} \right) \\
& \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) \left(1 - C \left(\frac{\kappa}{RD} \right)^\mu - \frac{Ct}{D^\omega} R^{-\theta} \right) - R^{1-\rho} \left(C \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu + Ct R^{-\theta} + \frac{2\kappa}{R} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the definition of D and rearranging we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^R h(x, t) dx & \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) - CR^{1-\rho} \frac{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)^\mu} \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu \\
& \quad - \frac{Ct}{R^\theta} R^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)^\omega} + 1 \right) - CR^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} + \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using that for $\delta, \omega \in (0, 1)$ and $R > R_0$ we have $\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} \leq \left(1 - \frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} \right)^\omega$ and thus $\left(\frac{1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t}}{\left(1 - \frac{R_0}{R} e^{-t} \right)^\omega} + 1 \right) \leq 2$ and $\frac{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right)^\mu} \leq 1$, we therefore get

$$\int_0^R h(x, t) dx \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \right) - \frac{Ct}{R^\theta} R^{1-\rho} - CR^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} + \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu \right).$$

As for $\delta t \leq 1$ (note that we assume $\delta, t \leq 1$) we can estimate $1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta e^{-\delta t} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta + \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \delta t$, we obtain

$$\int_0^R h(x, t) dx \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \right) + R^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \frac{\delta t}{e} - \frac{Ct}{R^\theta} R^{1-\rho} - CR^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} + \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu \right).$$

We now choose $\mu = \theta$ and $\kappa < 1$ sufficiently small. Then as we assume $R \geq R_0 \geq 1$ we have $\frac{\kappa}{R} \leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\mu = \left(\frac{\kappa}{R} \right)^\theta$. Using this we can further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^R h(x, t) dx & \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \right) + R^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \frac{\delta t}{e} - \frac{Ct}{R^\theta} R^{1-\rho} - \frac{C\kappa^\theta}{R^\theta} R^{1-\rho} \\
& \geq R^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \right) + R^{1-\rho} \left(\left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \frac{\delta t}{e} - \frac{C}{R^\theta} (t + \kappa^\theta) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it suffices to show $\left(\frac{R_0}{R} \right)^\delta \frac{\delta t}{e} - \frac{C}{R^\theta} (t + \kappa^\theta) \geq 0$ while this is equivalent to $R^{\theta-\delta} \geq C e^{\frac{t+\kappa^\theta}{R_0^\delta \delta t}}$, but this is true at least if we choose κ sufficiently small such that also $\kappa^\theta < t$, $0 < \delta < \theta$ and then R_0 sufficiently large (note that we have only to prove this for $R \geq R_0$). $\square$

2.6 Existence of self-similar solutions

Proposition 2.21. *Let K satisfy Assumptions (8)-(10). Then for any $\rho \in (\max\{0, b\}, 1)$ there exists a weak stationary solution h_ε to (6) (with K replaced by K_ε).*

This proposition is proved in the following way: according to Theorem 1.3 we obtain $h_\varepsilon^\lambda \in \mathcal{Y}$ that is stationary under the action of $S_\varepsilon^\lambda(t)$, i.e. H_ε^λ is a stationary mild solution of (21). Then taking a subsequence of h_ε^λ converging weakly to some h_ε and passing to the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in the equation shows the claim. The last step is quite similar to passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in Section 3.5 and thus we do not give details here.

We furthermore have the following result about the regularity and asymptotic behaviour of h_ε completing the proof of Proposition 2.1:

Proposition 2.22. *The solution $h_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Y}$ from Proposition 2.21 is continuous on $(0, \infty)$ and satisfies $h_\varepsilon(x) \sim (1 - \rho)x^{-\rho}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.*

This can be proved in a similar way as the corresponding result in [11, Lemma 4.2 & Lemma 4.3].

3 Passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

3.1 Strategy of the proof

Our starting point is that we have a continuous positive function h_ε that is a weak solution to

$$\partial_x I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon] = \partial_x(xh_\varepsilon) + (\rho - 1)h_\varepsilon, \quad \text{with} \quad I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon] = \int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy. \quad (33)$$

Furthermore we have the estimates

$$\int_0^r h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq r^{1-\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^r h_\varepsilon(x) dx / r^{1-\rho} = 1. \quad (34)$$

We introduce the following quantities:

$$\mu_\varepsilon = \int_0^1 h_\varepsilon(x) (x + \varepsilon)^{-a} dx, \quad \lambda_\varepsilon = \int_0^1 h_\varepsilon(x) (x + \varepsilon)^b dx, \quad L_\varepsilon := \max\left(\lambda_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{1+a}}, \mu_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{1-b}}\right). \quad (35)$$

Up to passing to a subsequence we can in the following assume that either L_ε converges or $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore as the case $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ behaves slightly different, we use from now on the following notation: we define $L := L_\varepsilon$ if $L_\varepsilon \not\rightarrow 0$ and $L := 1$ if $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and thus (up to passing maybe to another subsequence) we may assume $L > 0$. For the following let

$$X = \frac{x}{L}, \quad h_\varepsilon(x) = H_\varepsilon(X) L^{-\rho}.$$

The strategy of the proof is the following: First we derive a uniform lower integral bound for H_ε . This will be done by constructing a special test function that provides us with some estimate from below that is sufficient to conclude on a lower bound by some iteration argument. In order to obtain the same uniform lower bound for h_ε we need to exclude the case $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$. For this reason we will show that in this case H_ε converges to some limit H solving some differential equation that has no solution satisfying the growth condition $\int_0^R H dX \leq R^{1-\rho}$. Note that at this point it is crucial to assume $\rho > 0$. Using the lower bound on h_ε we can show some exponential decay of h_ε near zero which is then enough to pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For $0 < \kappa < 1$ we again denote in the following by φ_κ a non-negative, symmetric standard mollifier with $\text{supp } \varphi_\kappa \subset [-\kappa, \kappa]$.

3.2 Uniform lower bound for H_ε

In this subsection we will show a uniform lower bound on H_ε , i.e. we will prove:

Proposition 3.1. *For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $R_\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\int_0^R H_\varepsilon(X) dX \geq (1 - \delta) R^{1-\rho} \quad \text{for all } R \geq R_\delta. \quad (36)$$

3.2.1 Construction of a suitable test function

We start by constructing a special test function and therefore notice that for $\psi = \psi(x, t)$ with $\psi \in C^1$ and compact support in $[0, T] \times [0, \infty)$ we obtain from the equation on h_ε :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \partial_x \psi I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon] dx dt - \int_0^T \int_0^\infty x \partial_x \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt + (\rho - 1) \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \partial_t \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt + \int_0^\infty \psi(\cdot, 0) h_\varepsilon dx - \int_0^\infty \psi(\cdot, T) h_\varepsilon dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing ψ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^\infty \partial_x \psi I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon] dx dt - \int_0^T \int_0^\infty x \partial_x \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt + (\rho - 1) \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt - \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \partial_t \psi h_\varepsilon dx dt \geq 0 \quad (37)$$

we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \psi(\cdot, 0) h_\varepsilon dx \geq \int_0^\infty \psi(\cdot, T) h_\varepsilon dx.$$

Rewriting (37) we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_0^\infty h_\varepsilon(x) \left\{ \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(x, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) [\psi(x+y) - \psi(x)] dy - x \partial_x \psi(x) + (\rho - 1) \psi(x) - \partial_t \psi(x) \right\} dx dt \geq 0. \quad (38)$$

Defining W by $\psi(x, t) = e^{-(1-\rho)t} W(\xi, t)$ with $\xi = \frac{x}{Le^t}$ we can rewrite the term in brackets and obtain that it suffices to construct W such that

$$\partial_t W\left(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t\right) \leq \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(x, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\frac{x+y}{Le^t}, t\right) - W\left(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t\right) \right] dy. \quad (39)$$

For further use we also note that we only need this in weak form, i.e. we need that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^\infty e^{-(1-\rho)t} h_\varepsilon(x) \left\{ \partial_t W\left(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t\right) - \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(x, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\frac{x+y}{Le^t}, t\right) - W\left(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t\right) \right] dy \right\} dx dt \leq 0, \quad (40)$$

provided that we can justify the change from ψ to W .

We furthermore list here some parameters that are frequently used in the following. For given $\nu \in (0, 1)$ that will be fixed later we define

$$\beta := \begin{cases} b & b \geq 0 \\ \nu b & b < 0 \end{cases}, \quad \omega_1 := \min\{\rho - b, \rho\}, \quad \omega_2 := \rho, \quad \tilde{b} := \max\{0, b\}.$$

The idea to construct the test function W is similar to the approach in Section 2.5.2, i.e. we replace the integral kernel K_ε and h_ε by corresponding power laws. Due to the singular behaviour of K_ε (for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) the resulting integral is not defined near the origin and thus we have to consider the region near the origin separately. We have the following existence result.

Lemma 3.2. *For any constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ there exists a function $\tilde{W} \in C^1([0, T], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ solving*

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \tilde{W}(\xi, t) - C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left(L^b A^\beta (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} + L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (z + \varepsilon)^b \right) \left[\tilde{W}\left(\xi + \frac{z}{L}\right) - \tilde{W}(\xi) \right] dz \\ &- \frac{C}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{A^{-\nu a}}{\eta^{1+\omega_1}} \left[\tilde{W}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{W}(\xi) \right] d\eta - \frac{C}{L^{\rho-b}} \int_0^\infty \frac{A^\beta}{\eta^{1+\omega_2}} \left[\tilde{W}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{W}(\xi) \right] d\eta = 0 \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{W}(\cdot, 0) = \chi_{(-\infty, A-\kappa]} *^3 \varphi_{\kappa/3}(\cdot)$.

Proof. This is shown in Proposition B.8. $\square$

Remark 3.3. As shown in the appendix $\tilde{W}$ is non-increasing, has support in $(-\infty, A]$, is non-negative and bounded by 1.

As K_ε might get quite singular at the origin for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we define now W as the function $W(\xi, t) := \tilde{W}(\xi, t) \chi_{[A^\nu, \infty)}(\xi)$, i.e. we cut $\tilde{W}$ at $\xi = A^\nu$ in order to avoid integrating near the origin. Obviously W is not in C^1 and thus the corresponding ψ is also not differentiable. But as already mentioned it is enough to show that (40) holds, provided we can justify the change from ψ to W (and reverse). This will be done next, i.e. we will first show that (39) holds for all $\xi \neq A^\nu$. Then by convolution in ξ with φ_δ it is possible to change from ψ to W (and reverse). Finally taking the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ this then shows that (40) holds.

Lemma 3.4. *For sufficiently large $\tilde{C}$, inequality (39) holds pointwise for all $\xi \neq A^\nu$.*

Proof. From the non-negativity of W the claim follows immediately for $\xi < A^\nu$ (where W is identically zero). Thus it suffices to consider $\xi > A^\nu$. Using furthermore that $\text{supp } W \subset (-\infty, A]$ it suffices to consider $\xi \in (A^\nu, A]$. As W is non-increasing on $(A^\nu, A]$ we can estimate $-[W(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}) - W(\xi)] \leq -[W(\xi + \frac{y}{L}) - W(\xi)]$. On the other hand using the estimates on the kernel K we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W(\xi) \right] dy \\
& \leq -C_2 \int_0^\infty \frac{(Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^{-a} (y + \varepsilon)^b + (Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^b (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{L}\right) - W(\xi) \right] dy \\
& \leq -C \int_0^\infty \frac{L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (y + \varepsilon)^b + L^b A^\beta (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{L}\right) - W(\xi) \right] dy \\
& \leq -C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{y} \left[L^b A^\beta (y + \varepsilon)^{-a} + L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (y + \varepsilon)^b \right] \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{L}\right) - W(\xi) \right] dy \\
& \quad - \frac{C}{L^\rho} \int_{1/L}^\infty \frac{H_\varepsilon(\eta)}{\eta} \left[L^b A^\beta + L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (L\eta + \varepsilon)^b \right] [W(\xi + \eta) - W(\xi)] d\eta \\
& \leq -C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{y} \left[L^b A^\beta (y + \varepsilon)^{-a} + L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (y + \varepsilon)^b \right] \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{L}\right) - W(\xi) \right] dy \\
& \quad - \frac{CA^\beta}{L^{\rho-b}} \int_0^\infty \frac{H_\varepsilon(\eta)}{\eta} [W(\xi + \eta) - W(\xi)] d\eta - \frac{CA^{-\nu a}}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{H_\varepsilon(\eta)}{\eta^{1-\max\{0,b\}}} [W(\xi + \eta) - W(\xi)] d\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

As $\xi > A^\nu$ we have by construction

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t W(\xi, t) &= \partial_t \tilde{W}(\xi, t) = \tilde{C} \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[L^b A^\beta (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} + L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} (z + \varepsilon)^b \right] \left[\tilde{W}\left(\xi + \frac{z}{L}\right) - \tilde{W}(\xi) \right] dz \\
& \quad + \tilde{C} \frac{A^\beta}{L^{\rho-b}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\eta^{1+\omega_2}} [\tilde{W}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{W}(\xi)] d\eta + \tilde{C} \frac{A^{-\nu a}}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\eta^{1+\omega_1}} [\tilde{W}(\xi + \eta) - \tilde{W}(\xi)] d\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Thus in order to show (39), i.e.

$$\partial_t W(\xi, t) - \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}, t\right) - W(\xi, t) \right] dy \leq 0$$

it is sufficient to compare the expressions in (41) and (42) term by term. Proceeding in the same way as in Lemma 2.18 the claim follows, noting that due to the rescaling the estimates from Lemma A.1 also hold for H_ε . $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *The change of variables from ψ to W (and reverse) is justified and inequality (40) holds.*

Proof. We define $W_\delta := W(\cdot, t) * \varphi_\delta(\cdot)$. Then $W_\delta(\cdot, t)$ is smooth for all t and the change of variables from the corresponding ψ_δ to W_δ (and reverse) is justified. We next show that we can pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the left hand side of (40). Then from Lemma 3.4 the claim follows.

As $\partial_t W_\delta(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t)$ is compactly supported and uniformly bounded (in δ) it suffices to consider

$$\int_0^\infty h_\varepsilon(x) \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(x, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W_\delta\left(\frac{x+y}{Le^t}, t\right) - W_\delta\left(\frac{x}{Le^t}, t\right) \right] dy dx. \quad (43)$$

Changing variables, interchanging the order of integration and splitting the integral we have to consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{Le^t} \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right] d\xi dy \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^{A^\nu - r} (\dots) d\xi dy + \int_0^\infty \int_{A^\nu + r}^\infty (\dots) d\xi dy + \int_0^\infty \int_{A^\nu - r}^{A^\nu + r} (\dots) d\xi dy \\ &=: (I) + (II) + (III), \end{aligned}$$

where $2\delta < r$ is a fixed and sufficiently small constant. As W and W_δ are compactly supported and bounded (uniformly in δ) it is straightforward to pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the ξ -integrals (for fixed $y > 0$). It thus remains to show that it is also possible to pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the y -integral while this will be done by using Lebesgue's Theorem. We therefore estimate the three integrands separately. First we have using that W is non-negative, bounded and has support in $[A^\nu - \delta, A + \delta]$ as well as the estimate for K and Lemma A.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{A^\nu - r} \frac{1}{Le^t} \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right] d\xi \right| \\ & \leq \frac{C}{Le^t} \chi_{[Le^t(r-\delta), \infty)}(y) \int_0^{A^\nu - r} \frac{(Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^{-a} (y + \varepsilon)^b}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}, t\right) d\xi \\ & \quad + \frac{C}{Le^t} \chi_{[Le^t(r-\delta), \infty)}(y) \int_0^{A^\nu - r} \frac{(Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^b (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}, t\right) d\xi \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon, L, A) \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{y} \chi_{[Le^t \frac{r}{2}, \infty)}(y) \int_0^{A^\nu - r} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) d\xi \leq C(\varepsilon, L, A) (Le^t (A^\nu - r))^{1-\rho} \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{y} \chi_{[Le^t \frac{r}{2}, \infty)}(y). \end{aligned}$$

As the right hand side is independent of δ and integrable due to Lemma A.1 we can pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (I).

To estimate the integrand in (II) note that we can bound $h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi)$ for $\xi \in [A^\nu, A + \delta]$ uniformly in t for $t \in [0, T]$ as h_ε is continuous. Furthermore as W is differentiable in ξ on $[A^\nu + r, \infty)$ with bounded derivative (for $r > 0$ fixed and depending on κ) we can bound the L^∞ -norm of W_δ and $\partial_\xi W_\delta$ by the corresponding expression of W . Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{A^\nu + r}^{A + \delta} \frac{1}{Le^t} \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right] d\xi \right| \\ & \leq \frac{C}{Le^t} \int_{A^\nu + r}^{A + \delta} \frac{(Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^{-a} (y + \varepsilon)^b + (Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^b (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left| W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right| d\xi \\ & \leq C(L, A, r, \varepsilon, \kappa) \left(\|W\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_\xi W\|_{L^\infty([A^\nu + r, \infty))} \right) \frac{(y + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \min\left\{ \frac{y}{Le^t}, A - A^\nu + 1 - r \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Again the right hand side is independent of δ and integrable due to Lemma A.1. Thus we also can pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the y -integral in (II). Before estimating the integrand of (III) we first derive an estimate for the expression $\int_{A^\nu - r}^{A^\nu + r} |W_\delta(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}) - W_\delta(\xi)| d\xi$, i.e. for $y \in [0, Le^t r]$ we have

$$\int_{A^\nu - r}^{A^\nu + r} \left| W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right| d\xi \leq \int_{-\delta}^\delta \varphi_\delta(\eta) \int_{A^\nu - r}^{A^\nu + r} \left| W\left(\xi - \eta + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W(\xi - \eta) \right| d\xi d\eta.$$

We thus consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} \left| W\left(\xi - \eta + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W(\xi - \eta) \right| d\xi \\
&= \int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+\eta} W\left(\xi - \eta + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) d\xi + \int_{A^\nu+\eta}^{A^\nu+r} W(\xi - \eta) - W\left(\xi - \eta + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) d\xi \\
&= \int_{A^\nu-r+\frac{y}{Le^t}-\eta}^{A^\nu+\frac{y}{Le^t}} W(\xi) d\xi + \int_{A^\nu}^{A^\nu+r-\eta} W(\xi) d\xi - \int_{A^\nu+\frac{y}{Le^t}}^{A^\nu+r-\eta} W(\xi) d\xi - \int_{A^\nu+r-\eta}^{A^\nu+r-\eta+\frac{y}{Le^t}} W(\xi) d\xi \\
&\leq 2 \int_{A^\nu}^{A^\nu+\frac{y}{Le^t}} W(\xi) d\xi - \int_{A^\nu+r-\eta}^{A^\nu+r-\eta+\frac{y}{Le^t}} W(\xi) d\xi \leq 3 \|W\|_{L^\infty} \frac{y}{Le^t}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows $\int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} |W_\delta(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}) - W_\delta(\xi)| d\xi \leq 3 \|W\|_{L^\infty} \frac{y}{Le^t}$, i.e. for $y \in [0, Le^t r]$.

On the other hand for $y > Le^t r$ we have the trivial estimate

$$\int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} \left| W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right| d\xi \leq 2 \|W_\delta\|_{L^\infty} r \leq 2 \|W\|_{L^\infty} r$$

and thus altogether

$$\int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} \left| W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right| d\xi \leq C \min\left\{ \frac{y}{Le^t}, r \right\}.$$

Using this and again that h_ε is continuous we can also estimate the integrand in (III), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} \frac{1}{Le^t} \frac{K_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi, y)}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left[W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right] d\xi \\
&\leq C(L) \int_{A^\nu-r}^{A^\nu+r} \frac{(Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^{-a} (y + \varepsilon)^b + (Le^t \xi + \varepsilon)^b (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi) h_\varepsilon(y) \left| W_\delta\left(\xi + \frac{y}{Le^t}\right) - W_\delta(\xi) \right| d\xi \\
&\leq C(L, A, \varepsilon) \sup_{\xi \in [A^\nu-r, A^\nu+r]} |h_\varepsilon(Le^t \xi)| \frac{(y + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{y} h_\varepsilon(y) \min\left\{ \frac{y}{Le^t}, r \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma A.1 the right hand side is integrable and thus we can also bound the integrand in (III) independently of δ by some integrable function. Thus due to Lebesgue's Theorem we can pass to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (43) and the claim then follows using Lemma 3.4. $\square$

In the following we will now derive an estimate from below on W .

3.2.2 Lower bound on W

Lemma 3.6. *There exists $\sigma \in (\max\{b, \nu\}, 1)$ and $\theta > 0$ such that*

$$1 - W(A - A^\sigma) \leq Ct A^{-\theta}$$

for sufficiently large A .

Proof. From the construction in Section B.1 we know that $\tilde{W}$ can be written as $\tilde{W}(\xi, t) = \int_\xi^\infty G(\eta, t) d\eta$ with

$G = -\partial_\xi \tilde{W} = G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2$, where $G_{1,1}$, $G_{1,2}$ and G_2 solve

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t G_{1,1} &= \frac{CA^{-\nu a}}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\eta^{1+\omega_1}} [G_{1,1}(\xi + \eta) - G_{1,1}(\xi)] d\eta \\
G_{1,1}(\cdot, 0) &= \delta(\cdot - A + \kappa) * \varphi_{\kappa/3} \\
\partial_t G_{1,2} &= \frac{CA^\beta}{L^{\rho-b}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\eta^{1+\omega_2}} [G_{1,2}(\xi + \eta) - G_{1,2}(\xi)] d\eta \\
G_{1,2}(\cdot, 0) &= \delta(\cdot) * \varphi_{\kappa/3} \\
\partial_t G_2 &= C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[\frac{A^{-\nu a}}{L^a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + A^\beta L^\beta (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right] \cdot \left[G_2\left(\xi + \frac{z}{L}\right) - G_2(\xi) \right] dz \\
G_2(\cdot, 0) &= \delta(\cdot) * \varphi_{\kappa/3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Then one has from Lemma B.10 for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{-D} G_{1,2}(\xi, t) d\xi \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{D} \right)^\mu + \frac{CA^\beta t}{L^{\rho-b} D^{\omega_2}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^{-D+A} G_{1,1}(\xi, t) d\xi &= \int_{-\infty}^{(A-\kappa)-(D-\kappa)} G_{1,1}(\xi, t) d\xi \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{D-\kappa} \right)^\mu + \frac{CA^{-\nu a} t}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}} (D-\kappa)^{\omega_1}} \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{D} \right)^\mu + \frac{CA^{-\nu a} t}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}} D^{\omega_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $D \geq 1$, $\kappa \leq 1/2$ it holds $(D - \kappa)^{-\delta} \leq 2^\delta D^{-\delta}$. One thus needs an estimate for G_2 . This will be quite similar to the proof of Lemma B.10 but due to the different behaviour for $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $L_\varepsilon \not\rightarrow 0$ we sketch this here again. Defining $\tilde{G}_2(p, t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_2(\xi, t) e^{p(\xi - \kappa/3)} d\xi$ and multiplying the equation for G_2 in (44) by $e^{p(\xi - \kappa/3)}$ and integrating one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \tilde{G}_2(p, t) &= C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[(z + \varepsilon)^{-a} L^b A^\beta + (z + \varepsilon)^b L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} \right] \cdot \left[e^{-\frac{pz}{L}} - 1 \right] dz \tilde{G}_2(p, t) \\
&=: M(p, L) \tilde{G}_2(p, t).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{G}_2(p, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\kappa/3}(\xi) e^{p(\xi - \kappa/3)} d\xi \exp(-t |M(p, L)|)$ and one can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
|M(p, L)| &\leq C \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[(z + \varepsilon)^{-a} L^b A^\beta + (z + \varepsilon)^b L^{-a} A^{-\nu a} \right] \cdot \frac{pz}{L} dz \\
&= Cp (L^{b-1} A^\beta \mu_\varepsilon + L^{-a-1} A^{-\nu a} \lambda_\varepsilon) \leq Cp (A^\beta + A^{-\nu a}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the last step note that due to our notation either $L = L_\varepsilon$ (in the case $L_\varepsilon \not\rightarrow 0$) and then the estimate is due to the definition of L_ε . If $L = 1$ (in the case $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) one can assume without loss of generality that ε is such small that $L_\varepsilon \leq 1$ (and thus by definition also $\lambda_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon \leq 1$). Using this and inserting $p := \frac{1}{D}$ we obtain in the same way as in the proof of Lemma B.10:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{-D} G_2(\xi, t) d\xi \leq C \left(\left(\frac{\kappa}{D} \right)^\mu + \frac{t}{D} (A^\beta + A^{-\nu a}) \right).$$

Using these estimates on $G_{1,1}$, $G_{1,2}$ and G_2 one obtains from Lemma B.11 (note also Remark B.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \tilde{W}(A - D) &= \int_{-\infty}^{A-D} (G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2) d\xi \leq \int_{-\infty}^{A-\frac{D}{4}} G_{1,1} d\xi + \int_{-\infty}^{-\frac{D}{4}} G_{1,2} d\xi + \int_{-\infty}^{-\frac{D}{4}} G_2 d\xi \\
&\leq C \frac{\kappa^\mu}{D^\mu} + \frac{CA^{-\nu a} t}{L^{\rho+a-\max\{0,b\}} D^{\omega_1}} + \frac{CA^\beta t}{L^{\rho-b} D^{\omega_2}} + \frac{Ct (A^\beta + A^{-\nu a})}{D}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $D = A^\sigma$ (with $A \geq 1$) one has

$$1 - \tilde{W}(A - A^\sigma) \leq C\kappa^\mu A^{-\mu\sigma} + \frac{Ct}{L^{a+\omega_1}} A^{-\nu a - \sigma\omega_1} + \frac{Ct}{L^{\rho-b}} A^{\beta - \sigma\omega_2} + Ct(A^{\beta-\sigma} + A^{-\nu a - \sigma}).$$

In the case $L = 1$ (i.e. $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) it suffices to consider the exponents of A :

- $-\mu\sigma < 0$, as $\mu, \sigma > 0$,
- $-\nu a - \sigma\omega_1 < 0$, as $\omega_1, a > 0$,
- $\beta - \sigma\omega_2 = \beta - \sigma\rho = \begin{cases} b - \sigma\rho & b \geq 0 \\ \nu b - \sigma\rho & b < 0 \end{cases} < 0$, independently of the sign of b if we choose σ sufficiently close to 1 and $\sigma > \nu$ (as $b < \rho$).
- $\beta - \sigma = \begin{cases} b - \sigma & b \geq 0 \\ \nu b - \sigma & b < 0 \end{cases} < 0$, independently of the sign of b if we choose $\sigma > b$ as $\nu < 1$ and $b < 1$ (note that this choice of σ does not collide with the choice made before)
- $-\nu a - \sigma < 0$, as $a, \sigma > 0$.

Thus, taking $-\theta$ to be the maximum of the (negative) exponents proves the claim in this case.

If $L = L_\varepsilon$ (i.e. $L_\varepsilon \not\rightarrow 0$) one has to consider also the exponents of L :

- $a + \omega_1 > 0$, as $a, \omega_1 > 0$,
- $\rho - b > 0$, as by assumption $b < \rho$.

Thus either the two terms containing $L = L_\varepsilon$ are bounded (if L_ε is bounded) or converge to zero (if $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$) and so in both cases with the same $\theta > 0$ as above the claim follows. $\square$

3.2.3 The iteration argument

In this section we will show Proposition 3.1. We therefore define

$$F_\varepsilon(X) := \int_0^X H_\varepsilon(Y) dY \quad \text{while for } L_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ this reduces to } F_\varepsilon(x) = \int_0^x h_\varepsilon(y) dy.$$

We first show the following Lemma, that will be the key in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.7. *There exists $\theta > 0$ such that*

$$F_\varepsilon(A) \geq -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + F_\varepsilon((A - A^\sigma)e^T)e^{-(1-\rho)T} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A^\theta}\right)$$

for A sufficiently large.

Proof. From the choice of ψ and W respectively (using also the non-negativity and monotonicity properties of W)

$$\begin{aligned} F_\varepsilon(A) &= \int_0^A H_\varepsilon(X) dX \geq \int_0^\infty W(X, 0) H_\varepsilon(X) dX \geq e^{-(1-\rho)T} \int_0^\infty H_\varepsilon(X) W\left(\frac{X}{e^T}, T\right) dX \\ &\geq e^{-(1-\rho)T} \int_{A^\nu}^\infty \partial_X F_\varepsilon(X) W\left(\frac{X}{e^T}, T\right) dX \\ &= -e^{-(1-\rho)T} F_\varepsilon(A^\nu) W\left(\frac{A^\nu}{e^T}, T\right) - \int_{A^\nu}^\infty e^{-(1-\rho)T} e^{-T} F_\varepsilon(X) \partial_\xi W\left(\frac{X}{e^T}, T\right) dX \\ &\geq -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + e^{-(1-\rho)T} \int_{A^\nu e^{-T}}^\infty F_\varepsilon(Xe^T) (G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2)(X, T) dX \end{aligned}$$

where we changed variables in the last step and used that W is bounded, $\partial_\xi W = -G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2$ on (A^ν, ∞) as well as $F_\varepsilon(A^\nu) \leq A^{\nu(1-\rho)}$. Noting that for $\sigma > \nu$ we have $A^\nu e^{-T} \leq A - A^\sigma$ for sufficiently large A and using also the monotonicity of F_ε we can further estimate

$$\begin{aligned} F_\varepsilon(A) &\geq -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + e^{-(1-\rho)T} \int_{A-A^\sigma}^{\infty} F_\varepsilon(Xe^T) (G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2)(X, T) dX \\ &\geq -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + e^{-(1-\rho)T} F_\varepsilon((A - A^\sigma)e^T) \int_{A-A^\sigma}^{\infty} (G_{1,1} * G_{1,2} * G_2)(X, T) dX \\ &= -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + F_\varepsilon((A - A^\sigma)e^T) e^{-(1-\rho)T} W(A - A^\sigma) \\ &\geq -CA^{\nu(1-\rho)} + F_\varepsilon((A - A^\sigma)e^T) e^{-(1-\rho)T} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A^\theta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

while in the last step Lemma 3.6 was applied. $\square$

We are now prepared to prove Proposition 3.1. This will be done by some iteration argument using recursively Lemma 3.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $\alpha := e^T > 1$. For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $R_{\varepsilon, \delta} > 0$ such that $F_\varepsilon(R) \geq R^{1-\rho}(1 - \delta)$ for all $R \geq R_{\varepsilon, \delta}$. For $A_0 > \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$ we define a sequence $\{A_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ by $A_{k+1} := \alpha(A_k - A_k^\sigma)$. From the choice of A_0 one obtains that A_k is strictly increasing and one has $A_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore $\alpha A_k = A_{k+1} + \alpha A_k^\sigma$ and thus

$$A_k = \frac{A_{k+1}}{\alpha} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right).$$

By iteration one obtains for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$A_0 = \frac{A_N}{\alpha^N} \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right). \quad (45)$$

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k < N$ applying Lemma 3.7 one gets by induction:

$$F_\varepsilon(A_k) \geq F_\varepsilon(A_N) \alpha^{-(N-k)(1-\rho)} \prod_{n=k}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) - C \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} \alpha^{-(m-k)(1-\rho)} \left(\prod_{n=k}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)\right) A_m^{\nu(1-\rho)}, \quad (46)$$

where we use the convention $\sum_{k=l}^u a_k = 0$ and $\prod_{k=l}^u a_k = 1$ if $u < l$. Thus for $k = 0$ one particularly obtains

$$\begin{aligned} F_\varepsilon(A_0) &\geq F_\varepsilon(A_N) \alpha^{-N(1-\rho)} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) - C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{-m(1-\rho)} \left(\prod_{n=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)\right) A_m^{\nu(1-\rho)} \\ &= F_\varepsilon(A_N) \alpha^{-N(1-\rho)} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) - C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} \left(\prod_{n=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)\right) (\alpha^{-m} A_m)^{\nu(1-\rho)} \\ &=: (I) - (II). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

We now estimate the two terms separately.

Let $\delta_* := \delta/2$. Choosing N sufficiently large such that $A_N \geq R_{\varepsilon, \delta_*}$ one has, using also (45)

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\geq (1 - \delta_*) A_N^{1-\rho} \alpha^{-N(1-\rho)} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) = (1 - \delta_*) \left(\frac{A_N}{\alpha^N}\right)^{1-\rho} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) \\ &= (1 - \delta_*) A_0^{1-\rho} \frac{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)}{\left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right)\right)^{1-\rho}}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Let $0 < D_0 < D$ be parameters to be fixed later and assume $A_0 > D$. One has $A_{k+1} = \alpha (A_k - A_k^\sigma)$. Thus using the monotonicity of A_k

$$\frac{A_{k+1}}{A_k} = \alpha (1 - A_k^{\sigma-1}) > \alpha (1 - D_0^{\sigma-1}) =: \beta_0 > 1$$

if we fix D_0 sufficiently large as $\alpha > 1$. Using this, one has $A_{k+1} > \beta_0 A_k$ and thus by iteration $A_{k+1} > \beta_0^{k+1} A_0$. We continue to estimate (I) and thus consider first $\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)$ while we assume that D_0 is sufficiently large such that $\frac{C}{D^\theta} < 1$ and thus also $\frac{C}{A_n^\theta} < 1$ by the monotonicity of A_n . Taking the logarithm of the product one has using the estimate $\log(1-x) \geq -\frac{x}{1-x}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) &\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} -\frac{C}{A_n^\theta} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}} = -C \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{A_n^\theta - C} \geq -C \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\beta_0^{n\theta} A_0^\theta - C} \\ &\geq -C \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\beta_0^{n\theta}} \frac{1}{D^\theta - C} \geq -C \frac{\beta_0^\theta}{\beta_0^\theta - 1} \frac{1}{D^\theta - C} =: -\frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus one obtains using $\exp(-x) \geq 1-x$:

$$\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C}. \quad (49)$$

Considering $\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right)$ and applying again first the logarithm on the product and then using $\log(1+x) \leq x$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \log \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}} \leq \alpha \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} A_k^{\sigma-1} \leq \alpha A_0^{\sigma-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (\beta_0^{\sigma-1})^k \leq \alpha D^{\sigma-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\beta_0^{\sigma-1})^k \\ &=: C_\gamma D^{\sigma-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus one can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right)\right)^{1-\rho} &\leq \exp[(C_\gamma D^{\sigma-1})(1-\rho)] = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-\rho)^n C_\gamma^n D^{n(\sigma-1)}}{n!} \\ &\leq 1 + D^{\sigma-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_\gamma^n (1-\rho)^n}{n!} \leq 1 + \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Putting the estimates of (49) and (50) together one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right)}{\left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right)\right)^{1-\rho}} &\geq \frac{1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C}}{1 + \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}} = 1 - \frac{\frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} + \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}}{1 + \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} - \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Together with (48) this shows

$$(I) \geq (1 - \delta_*) A_0^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} - \frac{\exp(C_\gamma (1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}}\right). \quad (52)$$

To estimate (II) we note first that one has $\prod_{n=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) \leq 1$ as well as $\prod_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right) \geq 1$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using this as well as (45) for $N = m$ and $m = 0, \dots, N-1$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) &= C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} \left(\prod_{n=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{C}{A_n^\theta}\right) \right) (\alpha^{-m} A_m)^{\nu(1-\rho)} \leq C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} (\alpha^{-m} A_m)^{\nu(1-\rho)} \\
&= C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} \frac{A_0^{\nu(1-\rho)}}{\left(\prod_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{A_k^\sigma}{A_{k+1}}\right) \right)^{\nu(1-\rho)}} \leq C \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} A_0^{\nu(1-\rho)} \\
&\leq A_0^{\nu(1-\rho)} C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{(\nu-1)(1-\rho)m} =: C_\nu A_0^{\nu(1-\rho)}
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Putting together the estimates (52), (53) and (47) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\varepsilon(A_0) &\geq (1 - \delta_*) \left(1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} - \frac{\exp(C_\gamma(1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}} \right) A_0^{1-\rho} - C_\nu A_0^{\nu(1-\rho)} \\
&\geq A_0^{1-\rho} \left((1 - \delta_*) \left(1 - \frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} - \frac{\exp(C_\gamma(1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}} \right) - \frac{C_\nu}{D^{(1-\nu)(1-\rho)}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

We choose now D sufficiently large such that one has

- $D \geq (3C_\beta \frac{2-\delta}{\delta} + C)^{1/\theta}$ which is equivalent to $\frac{C_\beta}{D^\theta - C} \leq \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta}{2-\delta}$
- $D \geq (3 \exp(C_\gamma(1-\rho)) \frac{2-\delta}{\delta})^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$ which is equivalent to $\frac{\exp(C_\gamma(1-\rho))}{D^{1-\sigma}} \leq \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta}{2-\delta}$
- $D \geq \left(\frac{3C_\nu}{1-\delta/2} \frac{2-\delta}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{(1-\nu)(1-\rho)}}$ which is equivalent to $C_\nu \frac{1}{D^{(1-\nu)(1-\rho)}} \leq (1 - \delta/2) \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta}{2-\delta}$.

Inserting these estimates in (54) together with $\delta_* = \delta/2$ one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\varepsilon(A_0) &\geq A_0^{1-\rho} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\delta}{2-\delta} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta}{2-\delta} \right) \\
&= A_0^{1-\rho} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2-\delta} \right) = (1 - \delta) A_0^{1-\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim with $R_\delta = D$. □

3.3 Excluding $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$

Before we can pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have to exclude the case $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in order to obtain Proposition 3.1 also for h_ε (instead of H_ε). This will be done by some contradiction argument. We furthermore remark here that throughout this section we frequently use that we can bound

$$\int_0^1 (x + \varepsilon)^{-a} h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq L_\varepsilon^{1-b} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 (x + \varepsilon)^b h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq L_\varepsilon^{1+a} \tag{55}$$

due to the definition of L_ε in (35).

3.3.1 Deriving a limit equation for H_ε

We first show the following lemma, stating the convergence of a certain integral occurring later.

Lemma 3.8. Assume $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Let Q_ε be given by

$$Q_\varepsilon(X) := \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{L_\varepsilon} K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon X) dy.$$

Then there exists a (continuous) function Q such that $Q_\varepsilon \rightarrow Q$ locally uniformly up to a subsequence.

Proof. It suffices to show that both Q_ε as well as Q'_ε are uniformly bounded on each fixed interval $[d, D] \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. One has using (55)

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_\varepsilon(X)| &\leq C_2 \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{L_\varepsilon} \left((L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) dz \\ &\leq \frac{C_2}{L_\varepsilon} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} \int_0^1 (z + \varepsilon)^b h_\varepsilon(z) dz + \frac{C_2}{L_\varepsilon} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b \int_0^1 (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \\ &\leq C_2 L_\varepsilon^a (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} + C_2 L_\varepsilon^{-b} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b \\ &= C_2 \left(X + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^{-a} + C_2 \left(X + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^b \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

while the right hand side is clearly locally uniformly bounded under the given assumptions. Rewriting Q_ε one obtains

$$Q_\varepsilon(X) = \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{L_\varepsilon} K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon X, z) dz = L_\varepsilon^\gamma \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{L_\varepsilon} K_{\frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}} \left(X, \frac{z}{L_\varepsilon} \right) dz.$$

Furthermore from (11) one has

$$|\partial_y K_\varepsilon(y, z)| \leq C \left((z + \varepsilon)^{-a} + (z + \varepsilon)^b \right) \quad \text{for all } y \in [a, A]$$

and hence, similarly as before

$$\begin{aligned} |Q'_\varepsilon(X)| &\leq C L_\varepsilon^\gamma \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{L_\varepsilon} \left[\left(\frac{z + \varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^{-a} + \left(\frac{z + \varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^b \right] dz \\ &= C L_\varepsilon^{\gamma-1+a} \int_0^1 (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} h_\varepsilon(z) dz + C L_\varepsilon^{\gamma-1-b} \int_0^1 (z + \varepsilon)^b h_\varepsilon(z) dz \\ &\leq C \end{aligned}$$

where we used also $\gamma = b - a$. □

Lemma 3.9. Let $\rho \in (\max\{0, b\}, 1)$ and assume $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then there exists a measure H such that (up to a subsequence) $H_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{*} H$ and H satisfies

$$\partial_X(XH) + (\rho - 1)H - \partial_X(Q(X)H(X)) + \frac{H(X)Q(X)}{X} = 0 \quad (57)$$

in the sense of distributions with $Q(X) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{L_\varepsilon} K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon X) dy$.

Proof. Transforming the equation

$$\partial_x \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy \right) = \partial_x(xh_\varepsilon(x)) + (\rho - 1)h_\varepsilon(x)$$

to the rescaled variables $X = \frac{x}{L_\varepsilon}$ one obtains

$$\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} \partial_X \left(\int_0^{L_\varepsilon X} \int_{L_\varepsilon X - y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy \right) = \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} \partial_X \left(L_\varepsilon X \frac{H(X)}{L_\varepsilon^\rho} \right) + (\rho - 1) \frac{H_\varepsilon(X)}{L_\varepsilon^\rho}.$$

Testing with $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (in the rescaled X -variable), splitting the integral and interchanging the order of integration we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty (X \partial_X \psi(X) - (\rho - 1) \psi(X)) H_\varepsilon(X) dX \\
&= \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma}} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \frac{K_{\frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}}(Y, Z)}{Z} H_\varepsilon(Y) H_\varepsilon(Z) [\psi(Y+Z) - \psi(Y)] dZ dY \\
&\quad + \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon Y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) H_\varepsilon(Y) \left[\psi\left(Y + \frac{z}{L_\varepsilon}\right) - \psi(Y) \right] dz dY \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}}^{\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon} + Z} \partial_X \psi(X) dX \right) \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon Z)}{L_\varepsilon Z} h_\varepsilon(y) H_\varepsilon(Z) dZ dy \\
&= (I) + (II) + (III).
\end{aligned}$$

In the following we assume that $\text{supp } \psi \subset [d, D]$ with $d > 0$ and $D > 1$. Furthermore we can assume that $L_\varepsilon > 1$ is sufficiently large and that $\varepsilon < 1$ is sufficiently small (as we are assuming $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$). We first show that $(I) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(I)| \\
&\leq \frac{C_2}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma}} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \frac{\left(Y + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}\right)^{-a} \left(Z + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}\right)^b}{Z} H_\varepsilon(Y) H_\varepsilon(Z) |\psi(Y+Z) - \psi(Y)| dZ dY \\
&\quad + \frac{C_2}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma}} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \frac{\left(Y + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}\right)^b \left(Z + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon}\right)^{-a}}{Z} H_\varepsilon(Y) H_\varepsilon(Z) |\psi(Y+Z) - \psi(Y)| dZ dY \\
&\leq \frac{2^b C}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma}} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \frac{Y^{-a} Z^b + Y^b Z^{-a}}{Z} H_\varepsilon(Y) H_\varepsilon(Z) |\psi(Y+Z) - \psi(Y)| dZ dY \\
&\leq \frac{C \|\psi'\|_{L^\infty}}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma-a}} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^1 (Z^b + Y^b) H_\varepsilon(Y) H_\varepsilon(Z) dZ dY + \frac{C \|\psi\|_{L^\infty}}{L_\varepsilon^{\rho-\gamma}} \left[L_\varepsilon^a \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D H_\varepsilon(Y) dY \int_1^\infty Z^{b-1} H_\varepsilon(Z) dZ \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max\{L_\varepsilon^{-b}, D^b\} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D H_\varepsilon(Y) dY \int_1^\infty Z^{-a-1} H_\varepsilon(Z) dZ \right] \\
&\leq CL_\varepsilon^{\gamma+a-\rho} \max\{1, L_\varepsilon^{-b}, D^b\} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D H_\varepsilon(Y) dY \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^1 H_\varepsilon(Z) dZ + CL_\varepsilon^{\gamma-\rho} [L_\varepsilon^a D^{1-\rho} + \max\{L_\varepsilon^{-b}, D^b\} D^{1-\rho}] \\
&= CD^{1-\rho} L_\varepsilon^{b-\rho} \max\{D^b, L_\varepsilon^{-b}\} + CD^{1-\rho} L_\varepsilon^{b-\rho} + CD^{1-\rho} L_\varepsilon^{b-a-\rho} \max\{L_\varepsilon^{-b}, D^b\} \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e. for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by assumption).

Next we show $(II) \rightarrow \int_0^\infty \partial_X \psi(X) H(X) Q(X) dX$. As H_ε is a sequence of locally uniformly bounded (non-negative Radon) measures there exists a (non-negative Radon) measure H such that $H_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{*} H$ in the sense of measures. Using now Taylor's formula for ψ one obtains

$$\psi\left(Y + \frac{z}{L_\varepsilon}\right) - \psi(Y) = \psi'(Y) \cdot \frac{z}{L_\varepsilon} + \frac{z^2}{L_\varepsilon^2} \int_0^z (z-t) \psi''\left(Y + \frac{t}{L_\varepsilon}\right) dt.$$

Using this in (II) one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) &= \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon Y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) H_\varepsilon(Y) \cdot \frac{z}{L_\varepsilon} \psi'(Y) dz dY \\
&\quad + \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon Y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) H_\varepsilon(Y) \cdot \frac{z^2}{L_\varepsilon^2} \int_0^z (z-t) \psi''\left(Y + \frac{t}{L_\varepsilon}\right) dt dz dY \\
&= (II)_a + (II)_b
\end{aligned}$$

We consider terms separately beginning with $(II)_b$ (and assuming L_ε to be sufficiently large, i.e. $\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} < d$):

$$\begin{aligned}
|(II)_b| &\leq \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon^2} \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty \int_0^1 z^2 h_\varepsilon(z) K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon Y, z) H_\varepsilon(Y) \int_0^z \left| \psi''\left(Y + \frac{t}{L_\varepsilon}\right) \right| dt dz dY \\
&\leq \frac{C \|\psi''\|_\infty}{L_\varepsilon^2} \int_{d-\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^D \int_0^1 h_\varepsilon(z) H_\varepsilon(Y) \left[(L_\varepsilon Y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + (L_\varepsilon Y + \varepsilon)^b (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right] dz dY \\
&\leq \frac{CD^{1-\rho}}{L_\varepsilon^2} \left[(L_\varepsilon d - 1 + \varepsilon)^{-a} L_\varepsilon^{1+a} + \max \left\{ (L_\varepsilon D + \varepsilon)^b, (L_\varepsilon d - 1 + \varepsilon)^b \right\} L_\varepsilon^{1-b} \right] \\
&= CD^{1-\rho} \left[\frac{\left(d - \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^{-a}}{L_\varepsilon} + \frac{\max \left\{ \left(D + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^b, \left(d - \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^b \right\}}{L_\varepsilon} \right] \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (and $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$). On the other hand (using the symmetry of K_ε)

$$(II)_a = \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty H_\varepsilon(Y) \psi'(Y) \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{L_\varepsilon} K_\varepsilon(L_\varepsilon Y, z) dz dY = \int_{\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}}^\infty H_\varepsilon(Y) \psi'(Y) Q_\varepsilon(Y) dY.$$

Thus one obtains $(II)_a \rightarrow \int_0^\infty H(Y) Q(Y) \psi'(Y) dY$ directly from Lemma 3.8. It remains to show that $(III) \rightarrow \int_0^\infty H(Y) \frac{Q(Y)}{Y} \psi(Y) dY$. We first rewrite (III) as

$$\begin{aligned}
(III) &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \int_{\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}}^{\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon} + Z} \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon Z)}{L_\varepsilon Z} h_\varepsilon(y) H_\varepsilon(Z) \partial_X \psi(X) dX dy dZ \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon Z)}{L_\varepsilon Z} h_\varepsilon(y) H_\varepsilon(Z) \left[\psi(Z) + \psi\left(Z + \frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}\right) - \psi(Z) - \psi\left(\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}\right) \right] dy dZ.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $\text{supp } \psi \subset [d, D]$ we obtain for L_ε sufficiently large (i.e. $L_\varepsilon \geq \frac{2}{d}$) that $\psi\left(\frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}\right) = 0$ for all $y \in [0, 1]$. Thus using also the definition of Q_ε we can rewrite (III) as

$$\begin{aligned}
(III) &= \int_0^\infty \psi(Z) H_\varepsilon(Z) \frac{Q_\varepsilon(Z)}{Z} dZ + \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, L_\varepsilon Z)}{L_\varepsilon Z} h_\varepsilon(y) H_\varepsilon(Z) \left[\psi\left(Z + \frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}\right) - \psi(Z) \right] dy dZ \\
&=: (III)_a + (III)_b.
\end{aligned}$$

The integral $(III)_a$ converges (up to a subsequence) to $\int_0^\infty \psi(Z) H(Z) \frac{Q(Z)}{Z} dZ$ according to Lemma 3.8. It thus remains to show that $(III)_b$ converges to zero. To see this note that as ψ is smooth and compactly supported we have for $y \in [0, 1]$:

$$\left| \psi\left(Z + \frac{y}{L_\varepsilon}\right) - \psi(Z) \right| \leq C(\psi) \frac{y}{L_\varepsilon} \chi_{[d-\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}, \infty)}(Z) \leq \frac{C(\psi)}{L_\varepsilon} \chi_{[d-\frac{1}{L_\varepsilon}, \infty)}(Z).$$

Using this we can estimate

$$(III)_b \leq \frac{C(\psi)}{L_\varepsilon} \int_{d-1/L_\varepsilon}^\infty H_\varepsilon(Z) \frac{Q_\varepsilon(Z)}{Z} dZ.$$

From the estimates on Q_ε in (56) we obtain that the integral on the right hand side is bounded uniformly in ε and thus for $L_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ the right hand side converges to zero, concluding the proof. $\square$

3.3.2 Non-solvability of the limit equation

Lemma 3.10. *For $\rho \in (0, 1)$ there exists no solution H to (57) satisfying the lower bound (36) and $\int_0^R H(X) dX \leq R^{1-\rho}$ for each $R \geq 0$.*

Proof. Assuming such a solution exists and rewriting (57) one has

$$\partial_X ((X - Q(X)) H(X)) = \left((1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(X)}{X} \right) H(X).$$

Defining $F(X) := (X - Q(X)) H(X)$ this is equivalent to

$$\partial_X F(X) = \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(X)}{X}}{X - Q(X)} F(X) \quad \text{and thus} \quad F(X) = C \cdot \exp \left(\int_A^X \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(Y)}{Y}}{Y - Q(Y)} dY \right)$$

for some constant C . Considering Q one can assume (up to passing to a subsequence of ε again denoted by ε) that either $\lambda_\varepsilon \geq \mu_\varepsilon$ or $\mu_\varepsilon \geq \lambda_\varepsilon$ for all ε , while both cases will be denoted as $\lambda \geq \mu$ or $\mu \geq \lambda$ either. One can then estimate (using the definition of λ_ε and μ_ε):

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq Q(X) &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_2 \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{L_\varepsilon} \left((y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^b (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) dy \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{C_2}{L_\varepsilon} \left(L_\varepsilon^{1-b} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b + L_\varepsilon^{a+1} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_2 \left(\left(X + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^b + \left(X + \frac{\varepsilon}{L_\varepsilon} \right)^{-a} \right) \\ &= C_2 (X^b + X^{-a}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} Q(X) &\geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_1 \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(y)}{L_\varepsilon} \left((y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^b (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) dy \\ &\geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{C_1}{L_\varepsilon} \begin{cases} L_\varepsilon^{1-b} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^b & \mu \geq \lambda \\ L_\varepsilon^{1+a} (L_\varepsilon X + \varepsilon)^{-a} & \lambda \geq \mu \end{cases} \\ &= C_1 \begin{cases} X^b & \mu \geq \lambda \\ X^{-a} & \lambda \geq \mu. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This shows in particular that for sufficiently large A one has $Q(X) < X$ for all $X \geq A$ and F is well defined for $X \geq A$. We claim now $C > 0$. To see this assume $C \leq 0$. Then $F \leq 0$ and as just shown $X - Q(X) \geq 0$ for $X \geq A$. As $H(X) = \frac{F(X)}{X - Q(X)}$ one has (using $\int_0^R H dX \geq \frac{R^{1-\rho}}{2}$ for sufficiently large R due to Proposition 3.1 and $\int_0^A H dX \leq A^{1-\rho}$):

$$0 \geq \int_A^R H(X) dX = \int_0^R H(X) dX - \int_0^A H(X) dX \geq \frac{1}{2} R^{1-\rho} - A^{1-\rho} = R^{1-\rho} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{A}{R} \right)^{1-\rho} \right) > 0$$

for sufficiently large R and thus a contradiction. Therefore we have $C > 0$.

We choose now $X_0 < A$ such that $Q(X_0) = X_0$ and $Q(X) < X$ for all $X > X_0$ which is possible due to the lower and upper bound for Q . We get that $\frac{X-Q(X)}{X-X_0}$ is bounded on $[X_0, \infty)$ and thus we have $X - Q(X) \leq K(X - X_0)$ for some $K > 0$. Furthermore as $Q(Y) \sim Y$ for $Y \rightarrow X_0$ we obtain

$$-(1 - \rho) + \frac{Q(Y)}{Y} = \rho - 1 + \frac{Q(Y)}{Y} \geq \rho - \delta > 0$$

on $[X_0, \bar{X}]$ for some $\bar{X} > X_0$ close to X_0 and $\delta > 0$. We then get

$$\int_{\bar{X}}^A \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(Y)}{Y}}{Y - Q(Y)} dY := C(\bar{X}, A) < \infty.$$

Using the definition of F we can then write H as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{C}{X - Q(X)} \exp \left(- \int_X^A \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(Y)}{Y}}{Y - Q(Y)} dY \right) \\ &\geq \frac{C}{K(X - X_0)} \exp \left(- \int_X^{\bar{X}} \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(Y)}{Y}}{Y - Q(Y)} dY - \int_{\bar{X}}^A \frac{(1 - \rho) - \frac{Q(Y)}{Y}}{Y - Q(Y)} dY \right) \\ &\geq \frac{C}{K(X - X_0)} \exp(-C(\bar{X}, A)) \exp \left((\rho - \delta) \int_X^{\bar{X}} \frac{1}{K(Y - X_0)} dY \right) \\ &= \frac{C}{K} \exp(-C(\bar{X}, A)) (\bar{X} - X_0)^{\frac{\rho - \delta}{K}} \frac{1}{(X - X_0)^{1 + \frac{\rho - \delta}{K}}} = C(A, \bar{X}, X_0, K) \frac{1}{(X - X_0)^{1 + \alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha = \frac{\rho - \delta}{K} > 0$, contradicting the local integrability of H . $\square$

This shows that L_ε has to be bounded and thus by scale invariance we obtain from Proposition 3.1 also the lower bound for h_ε , i.e. we have

Proposition 3.11. *For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $R_\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx \geq (1 - \delta) R^{1 - \rho} \quad \text{for all } R \geq R_\delta. \quad (58)$$

3.4 Exponential decay at the origin

We will show in this section that h_ε decays exponentially near zero in an averaged sense, a property that will be crucial when passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.12. *There exist constants C and c independent of ε such that*

$$\int_0^D h_\varepsilon(y) dy \leq CD^{1 - \rho} \exp(-c(D + \varepsilon)^{-a})$$

for any $D \in (0, 1]$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$, then due to Proposition 3.11 there exists $R_* > 0$ such that $\int_0^{B_2 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \geq \frac{(B_2 R_*)^{1 - \rho}}{2}$ for any $B_2 \geq 1$. On the other hand one has $\int_0^{B_1 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \leq (B_1 R_*)^{1 - \rho}$ for any $B_1 \geq 0$. Thus one has

$$\int_{B_1 R_*}^{B_2 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz = \int_0^{B_2 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz - \int_0^{B_1 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \geq \frac{(B_2 R_*)^{1 - \rho}}{2} - (B_1 R_*)^{1 - \rho} \geq 1$$

for sufficiently large B_2 (depending on B_1). Thus one can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^R \int_{R-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy \\
& \geq C_1 \int_0^R \int_{B_1 R_*}^{B_2 R_*} \frac{(y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^b (z + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy \\
& \geq \frac{C_1}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(y) dy \int_{B_1 R_*}^{B_2 R_*} \frac{(z + \varepsilon)^b}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \\
& \geq \frac{C}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(y) dy (B_2 R_*)^{b-1} \int_{B_1 R_*}^{B_2 R_*} h_\varepsilon(z) dz \geq \frac{C}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} (B_2 R_*)^{b-1} \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this and taking $\chi_{(-\infty, R]}$ (restricted to $[0, \infty)$) by some approximation argument as test function in the equation $(1 - \rho) h_\varepsilon(x) - \partial_x(x h_\varepsilon(x)) + \partial_x I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon](x) = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (1 - \rho) \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx - R h_\varepsilon(R) + \int_0^R \int_{R-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy \\
&\geq (1 - \rho) \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx - R h_\varepsilon(R) + \frac{C}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} (B_2 R_*)^{b-1} \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus one has

$$(1 - \rho) \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx + \frac{C (B_2 R_*)^{b-1}}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq R h_\varepsilon(R) = R \partial_R \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx$$

or equivalently

$$\partial_R \left(\int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx \right) \geq \left(\frac{1 - \rho}{R} + \frac{C (B_2 R_*)^{b-1}}{R (R + \varepsilon)^a} \right) \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx \geq \left(\frac{1 - \rho}{R} + \frac{C (B_2 R_*)^{b-1}}{(R + \varepsilon)^a} \right) \int_0^R h_\varepsilon(x) dx,$$

where we used $\frac{1}{R(R + \varepsilon)^a} \geq \frac{1}{(R + \varepsilon)^a}$ for $R \in [D, 1]$. Integrating this inequality over $[D, 1]$ and using $\int_0^1 h_\varepsilon dx \leq 1$ as well as $(1 + \varepsilon)^{-a} \leq 1$ gives

$$\int_0^D h_\varepsilon(x) dx \leq \exp \left(\frac{C (B_2 R_*)^{b-1}}{a} \right) D^{1-\rho} \exp \left(-\frac{C (B_2 R_*)^{b-1}}{a} (D + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right).$$

□

Lemma 3.13. *For $D \leq 1$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ one has the following estimate*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^D (x + \varepsilon)^\alpha h_\varepsilon(x) dx &\leq C D^{1-\rho} (D + \varepsilon)^\alpha \exp \left(-c (D + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) \quad \text{if } \alpha \geq 0 \\
\int_0^D (x + \varepsilon)^\alpha h_\varepsilon(x) dx &\leq \tilde{C} D^{1-\rho} \exp \left(-\frac{c}{2} (D + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) \quad \text{if } \alpha < 0
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The case $\alpha \geq 0$ follows immediately from Lemma 3.12. The case $\alpha < 0$ follows from Lemma 3.12 using a dyadic decomposition as in Lemma A.1. □

As $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is a locally bounded sequence of non-negative Radon measures one can extract a subsequence (again denoted by ε) such that $h_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{*} h$ in the sense of measures. As a direct consequence of Lemma 3.13 one obtains:

Lemma 3.14. For $D \leq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^D x^\alpha h(x) dx &\leq \tilde{C} D^{1-\rho} \exp\left(-\frac{c}{2} D^{-a}\right) \quad \text{if } \alpha < 0 \\ \int_0^D x^\alpha h(x) dx &\leq C D^{1+\alpha-\rho} \exp(-c D^{-a}) \quad \text{if } \alpha \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.13. □

As a consequence of Lemma 3.14 together with Lemma A.1 we obtain

Corollary 3.15. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $D > 0$ each limit h satisfies

1. $\int_0^\infty x^\alpha h(x) dx < \infty$ if $\alpha < \rho - 1$,
2. $\int_0^D x^\alpha h(x) dx < C(D)$.

Remark 3.16. We obtain corresponding results for h_ε and h with x^α replaced by $(x + \varepsilon)^\alpha$.

3.5 Passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

In this section we will finally conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 by passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (33). Before doing this we first show that $I[h]$ is locally integrable:

Lemma 3.17. For h as given above one has $I[h] \in L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty))$.

Proof. Let $D > 0$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^D I[h](x) dx &= \int_0^D \int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z)}{z} h(y) h(z) dz dy dx \\ &\leq C \int_0^D \int_0^D \int_0^\infty (y^{-a} z^{b-1} + y^b z^{-a-1}) h(y) h(z) dz dy dx \\ &\leq C \int_0^D \int_0^D (y^{-a} + y^b) h(y) dy dx \leq C(D) \end{aligned}$$

where Corollary 3.15 was used. One similarly gets $\int_N I[h] dx = 0$ for bounded null sets $N \subset [0, \infty)$. □

To show that h is a (weak) self-similar solution it only remains to pass to the limit in the weak form of the equation

$$\partial_x I_\varepsilon[h_\varepsilon] = \partial_x(x h_\varepsilon) + (\rho - 1) h_\varepsilon.$$

Thus let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty))$. Then the weak form reads as

$$\int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dz dy dx = \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) x h_\varepsilon(x) dx + (1 - \rho) \int_0^\infty \varphi(x) h_\varepsilon(x) dx.$$

One can easily pass to the limit in the right hand side. To prove Theorem 1.1 it thus remains to show that one can also take the limit in the left hand side of this equation. This will be done in the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.18. For any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty))$ one has

$$\int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) h_\varepsilon(y) dz dy dx \longrightarrow \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z)}{z} h(z) h(y) dz dy dx$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Taking the difference of the two integrals and rewriting one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z)}{z} h(y) h(z) - \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(y) h_\varepsilon(z) dy dz \right) dx \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K(y, z) - K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h(y) h(z) dz dy \right) dx \right| \\
& + \left| \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h(y) (h(z) - h_\varepsilon(z)) dz dy \right) dx \right| \\
& + \left| \int_0^\infty \partial_x \varphi(x) \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon(y, z)}{z} h_\varepsilon(z) (h(y) - h_\varepsilon(y)) dz dy \right) dx \right| =: (I) + (II) + (III)
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the three terms separately and take $D > 0$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [0, D]$. Then due to Lebesgue's Theorem (using also Corollary 3.15 and Lemma A.1) we obtain

$$(I) \leq \int_0^\infty |\partial_x \varphi(x)| \left(\int_0^x \int_{x-y}^\infty \frac{|K(y, z) - K_\varepsilon(y, z)|}{z} h(y) h(z) dz dy \right) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

To estimate the other two terms we will need some cutoff functions. Let $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\zeta_1^N, \zeta_2^N, \xi_1^M, \xi_2^M \in C^\infty([0, \infty))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_1^N &= 0 \text{ on } \left[0, \frac{1}{N}\right] \cup [N+1, \infty), \quad \zeta_1^N = 1 \text{ on } \left[\frac{2}{N}, N\right], \quad 0 \leq \zeta_1^N \leq 1, \quad \zeta_2^N := 1 - \zeta_1^N, \\
\xi_1^M &= 0 \text{ on } \left[0, \frac{1}{M}\right], \quad \xi_1^M = 1 \text{ on } \left[\frac{2}{M}, \infty\right), \quad 0 \leq \xi_1^M \leq 1, \quad \xi_2^M := 1 - \xi_1^M.
\end{aligned}$$

Defining $K_\varepsilon^{i,N}(y, z) := K_\varepsilon(y, z) \cdot \zeta_i^N(z)$ for $i = 1, 2$ one obtains using also Fubini's Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) & \leq \left| \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^{1,N}(y, z)}{z} h(y) (h(z) - h_\varepsilon(z)) \int_y^{y+z} \partial_x \varphi(x) dx dy dz \right| \\
& + \left| \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\varepsilon^{2,N}(y, z)}{z} h(y) (h(z) - h_\varepsilon(z)) \int_y^{y+z} \partial_x \varphi(x) dx dy dz \right| =: (II)_a + (II)_b
\end{aligned}$$

We consider again terms separately and without loss of generality we assume $\varepsilon < 1$. Then using Corollary 3.15 and Lemma A.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(II)_b & \leq C \|\partial_x \varphi\|_\infty \int_0^{\frac{2}{N}} \int_0^D \left[(y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^b (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right] h(y) (h(z) + h_\varepsilon(z)) dy dz \\
& + C \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_N^\infty \int_0^D \frac{(y + \varepsilon)^{-a} (z + \varepsilon)^b + (y + \varepsilon)^b (z + \varepsilon)^{-a}}{z} h(y) (h(z) + h_\varepsilon(z)) dy dz \\
& \leq \|\partial_x \varphi\|_\infty C(D) \int_0^{\frac{2}{N}} \left((z + \varepsilon)^b + (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} \right) (h(z) + h_\varepsilon(z)) dz \\
& + C(D) \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_N^\infty \left(2^{\tilde{b}} z^{b-1} + z^{-a-1} \right) (h(z) + h_\varepsilon(z)) dz \\
& \leq \|\partial_x \varphi\|_\infty C(D) \left[\frac{1}{N^{1-\rho}} \left(\frac{2}{N} + \varepsilon \right)^{\tilde{b}} + \frac{1}{N^{1-\rho}} \right] + C(D) \|\varphi\|_\infty [N^{b-\rho} + N^{-a-\rho}] \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore one has

$$(II)_a = \left| \int_0^\infty (h(z) - h_\varepsilon(z)) \psi_\varepsilon^N(z) dz \right| \tag{60}$$

with $\psi_\varepsilon^N(z) := \int_0^D \frac{K_\varepsilon^{1,N}(y,z)}{z} h(y) [\varphi(y+z) - \varphi(y)] dy$. We claim that $\psi_\varepsilon^N \rightarrow \psi^N$ strongly in $C([0, \infty))$ with $\psi^N(z) := \int_0^D \frac{K(y,z)}{z} h(y) \zeta_1^N(z) [\varphi(y+z) - \varphi(y)] dy$. Note that by construction we have $\text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon^N \subset [\frac{1}{N}, N+1]$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. To show (uniform) convergence we have to use a cutoff also in y , i.e. one can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi^N(z) - \psi_\varepsilon^N(z)| &\leq \left| \int_0^D \frac{K(y,z) - K_\varepsilon(y,z)}{z} \zeta_1^N(z) \xi_1^M(y) h(y) [\varphi(y+z) - \varphi(y)] dy \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^D \frac{K(y,z) - K_\varepsilon(y,z)}{z} \zeta_1^N(z) \xi_2^M(y) h(y) [\varphi(y+z) - \varphi(y)] dy \right| \\ &=: (II)_{a,1} + (II)_{a,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using similar arguments as in (59) we get

$$(II)_{a,2} \leq C(N, \varphi) \left[\frac{1}{M^{1+b-\rho}} + \frac{1}{M^{1-\rho}} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (61)$$

for $M \rightarrow \infty$ and N fixed. As K is continuous on $[\frac{1}{M}, D] \times [\frac{1}{N}, N+1]$ for $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, one has $K_\varepsilon \rightarrow K$ uniformly on $[\frac{1}{M}, D] \times [\frac{1}{N}, N+1]$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus we get $(II)_{a,1} \rightarrow 0$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (with M, N fixed). Together with (61) this shows that $\psi_\varepsilon^N \rightarrow \psi^N$ strongly. Thus one can pass to the limit in (60) to obtain together with (59): $(II) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

In a similar way we can show that $(III) \rightarrow 0$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. □

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge support through the CRC 1060 *The mathematics of emergent effects* at the University of Bonn that is funded through the German Science Foundation (DFG).

A Moment estimates

Lemma A.1. *Let $h \in \mathcal{X}_\rho$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then one has the following estimates*

1. $\int_0^D x^\alpha h(x) dx \leq C \|h\| D^{1-\rho+\alpha}$ for all $D > 0$ if $\rho - 1 < \alpha$,
2. $\int_D^\infty x^\alpha h(x) dx \leq C \|h\| D^{1-\rho+\alpha}$ for all $D > 0$ if $\alpha < \rho - 1$,

where $\|h\|$ is defined in (14).

Proof.

1. The case $\alpha \geq 0$ is clear by definition of $\mathcal{X}_\rho$. For $\alpha \in (\rho - 1, 0)$ one has, using a dyadic decomposition, that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^D x^\alpha h(x) dx &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-(n+1)}D}^{2^{-n}D} x^\alpha h(x) dx \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\alpha(n+1)} D^\alpha \int_{2^{-(n+1)}D}^{2^{-n}D} h(x) dx \\ &\leq \|h\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\alpha(n+1)} D^\alpha (2^{-n}D)^{1-\rho} = 2^{-\alpha} \|h\| D^{1+\alpha-\rho} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (2^{1+\alpha-\rho})^{-n} = C(\alpha, \rho) \|h\| D^{1+\alpha-\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

2. This follows similarly using again a dyadic decomposition. □

B Dual problems

B.1 Existence results

In this section we show the existence of solutions to some dual problems arising in the proof of the lower bounds. Throughout this section we will use the following notation: $\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$ will denote the space of finite measures, $\mathcal{M}_+^{\text{fin}}$ is the space on non-negative finite measures. Furthermore C_b^n denotes the space of bounded n -times differentiable functions with bounded derivatives. Let $\omega \in (0, 1)$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the equation

$$\partial_t f(x, t) - P \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega}} [f(x+y) - f(x)] dy = 0 \quad (62)$$

together with initial value $f(x, 0) = \delta(\cdot - A)$.

Proposition B.1. *There exists a (weak) solution $f \in C([0, T], \mathcal{M}_+^{\text{fin}})$ of (62) with initial value $f_0 = \delta(\cdot - A)$. Furthermore this f satisfies $\text{supp } f(\cdot, t) \subset (-\infty, A]$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\cdot, t) dx = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.*

Proof (Sketch). First we consider the regularized equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f(x, t) &= P \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} [f(x+y, t) - f(x, t)] dy \\ f(\cdot, 0) &= \delta(\cdot - A) \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

with $\nu > 0$. In the second step we will pass to the limit $\nu \rightarrow 0$. We can reformulate (63) as the following fixed-point problem:

$$f^\nu(x, t) = \delta(x - A) e^{-P \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} dy} + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} dy} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} f(x+y) dy ds. \quad (64)$$

It is straightforward, applying the contraction mapping theorem, to obtain a solution $f \in C([0, T], \mathcal{M}_+^{\text{fin}})$ for any $T > 0$. Furthermore, one obtains $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f^\nu(x, t) dx = 1$ for all $t > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ (by integrating the equation, see below). In addition f^ν satisfies equation (63) in weak form, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f^\nu(x, t) \psi(x) dx = \psi(A) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} f^\nu(x, s) [\psi(x-y) - \psi(x)] dy dx ds \quad (65)$$

for all $\psi \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$ and for $0 < \tilde{\omega} < \omega$ taking $\psi(x) = |x|^{\tilde{\omega}}$ and using $||x-y|^{\tilde{\omega}} - |x|^{\tilde{\omega}}| \leq |y|^{\tilde{\omega}}$ we obtain (by approximation)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^\nu(x, t) |x|^{\tilde{\omega}} dx &\leq |A|^{\tilde{\omega}} + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^\infty \frac{||x-y|^{\tilde{\omega}} - |x|^{\tilde{\omega}}|}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} f^\nu(x, s) dy dx ds \\ &\leq |A|^{\tilde{\omega}} + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^\infty \frac{|y|^{\tilde{\omega}}}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} f^\nu(x, s) dy dx ds \leq C(T, \omega, \tilde{\omega}, A). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^{\tilde{\omega}} f^\nu(x, t) dx$ is uniformly bounded (i.e. independent of ν and t).

Using this and that $\{f^\nu\}_{\nu>0}$ is uniformly bounded by 1, we can extract a subsequence $\{f^{\nu_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (denoted in the following as $\{f^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$) such that $f^n(\cdot, t_k)$ converges in the sense of measures to some $f(\cdot, t_k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\{t_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = [0, T] \cap \mathbb{Q}$.

We next show that f^n is equicontinuous in t as a distribution, i.e. from (65) we obtain for any $\psi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f^n(x, t) - f^n(x, s)) \psi(x) dx \right| &= \left| \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^n(x, r) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} [\psi(x-y) - \psi(x)] dy dx dr \right| \\ &\leq \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^n(x, r) \left[\int_0^1 \frac{\|\psi'\|_{L^\infty} y}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} dy + \int_1^\infty \frac{2\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}}{y^{1+\omega} + \nu} dy \right] dx dr \leq C(\psi) |t - s|, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\psi)$ is a constant independent of ν but depending on ψ and ψ' . Using the equicontinuity of f^n (as a distribution) one can show that f^n converges to some limit f (in the sense of distributions) for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Using furthermore the uniform boundedness of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^{\tilde{\omega}} f^n(x, t) dx$ one can show that f^n converges already in the sense of measures by approximating and cutting the test function for large values of $|x|$.

Using similar arguments we can also show that for the limit $f^n \rightharpoonup f$ we have $f \in C([0, T], \mathcal{M}_+^{\text{fin}})$ and taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (65), f satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x, t) \psi(x) dx = \psi(A) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{y^{1+\omega}} f(x, s) [\psi(x-y) - \psi(x)] dy dx ds \quad (66)$$

for each $\psi \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and all $t \in [0, T]$.

From the construction of f using the contraction mapping principle we immediately get $\text{supp } f(\cdot, t) \subset (-\infty, A]$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. To see $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\cdot, t) dx = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ we integrate equation (62) over $\mathbb{R}$ and use Fubini's theorem to obtain $\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(\cdot, t) dx = 0$. Thus together with the initial condition the claim follows. $\square$

Remark B.2. The analogous result holds true if $f_0 = -\delta(\cdot - A)$.

As a direct consequence of Proposition B.1 we also obtain smooth solutions for smoothed initial data. Therefore for $\kappa > 0$ we denote in the following by φ_κ a non-negative, symmetric standard mollifier with $\text{supp } \varphi_\kappa \subset [-\kappa, \kappa]$.

Proposition B.3. *Let $f_0 := \delta(\cdot - A)$. Then there exists a solution $f \in C^1([0, T], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ to (62) with initial datum $f_0 * \varphi_\kappa = \varphi_\kappa(\cdot - A)$.*

Proof. This follows directly by convolution in x from Proposition B.1. $\square$

Proposition B.4. *There exists a strong solution $f \in C^1([0, T], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ to (62) with initial datum $f_0 := \chi_{(-\infty, A]} * \varphi_\kappa$.*

Proof. Let G be the solution given by Proposition B.3 for $G_0 := \delta(\cdot - A) * \varphi_\kappa$. Then $f(x, t) := \int_x^\infty G(y, t) dy$ solves (62) with the desired initial condition. $\square$

In the same way as in the proofs of Proposition B.4 and Proposition B.4 we obtain the following existence result:

Proposition B.5. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $L > 0$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ be two constants (depending on some parameters). Then there exists a weak solution $G \in C([0, T], \mathcal{M}_+^{\text{fin}})$ and a strong solution $W \in C([0, T], C^\infty)$ of the equation*

$$\partial_t W(\xi, t) - \int_0^1 \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[\lambda_1 (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} + \lambda_2 (z + \varepsilon)^b \right] \left[W\left(\xi + \frac{z}{L}, t\right) - W(\xi, t) \right] dz = 0 \quad (67)$$

together with initial condition $G(\cdot, 0) = \delta(\cdot - A)$ and $W(\cdot, 0) = \chi_{(-\infty, A]} * \varphi_\kappa$.

Remark B.6. The measure G has the same properties as the measure f in Proposition B.1.

Remark B.7. By convolution we also obtain a strong solution $G \in C([0, T], C^\infty)$ of (67) with initial condition $G(\cdot, 0) = \delta(\cdot - A) * \varphi_\kappa$.

For further use we denote the integral kernels occurring in Proposition B.1 and Proposition B.5 by

$$N_\omega(z) := z^{-1-\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad N_\varepsilon(z) := \frac{h_\varepsilon(z)}{z} \left[\lambda_1 (z + \varepsilon)^{-a} + \lambda_2 (z + \varepsilon)^b \right]. \quad (68)$$

Proposition B.8. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N_i: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ either of the form N_{ω_i} for some $\omega_i \in (0, 1)$ or N_ε given by (68) (and then continued by 0 to $(0, \infty)$) for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $N := \sum_{i=1}^n N_i$. Then there exists a solution $f \in C^1([0, T], C^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ to the equation*

$$\partial_t f(x, t) = \int_0^\infty N(z) [f(x+z) - f(x)] dz \quad (69)$$

either with initial datum $f_0 = \chi_{(-\infty, R]} *^n \varphi_\kappa$ or $f_0 = \delta(\cdot - R) *^n \varphi_\kappa$, where $*^n$ denotes the n -fold convolution with φ_κ .

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $n = 2$ (otherwise argue by induction). Then by Proposition B.3 and Proposition B.4 there exist solutions f^i to equation (69) with N replaced by N_i and initial datum $f_0^1 = \delta(\cdot) * \varphi_\kappa$ and $f_0^2 = \chi_{(-\infty, R]} * \varphi_\kappa$ (or $f_0^2 = \delta(\cdot - R) * \varphi_\kappa$). A straightforward computation shows that the convolution $f := f^1 * f^2$ satisfies (69) together with the correct initial condition. $\square$

Remark B.9. Let G_κ and f_κ be the solutions given by Proposition B.8 with initial condition $G_\kappa(\cdot, 0) = \delta(\cdot - A) * \varphi_\kappa$ and $f(\cdot, 0) = \chi_{(-\infty, A]} * \varphi_\kappa$. Then from the construction in the proof of Proposition B.8 and Proposition B.1 we obtain:

1. $G_\kappa \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}$ (in the sense of measures) and $0 \leq f_\kappa \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$,
2. $\text{supp } G_\kappa(\cdot, t), \text{supp } f_\kappa(\cdot, t) \subset (-\infty, A + n\kappa]$ for all $t \in [0, T]$,
3. $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(\cdot, t) dx = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$,
4. f_κ is non-increasing.

B.2 Integral estimates for subsolutions

In this section we will always assume that the integral kernel N is given as the sum of kernels of the form N_{ω_i} or N_ε and we will prove several properties and estimates that are frequently used. We now prove some integral estimates.

Lemma B.10. *Let $\omega \in (0, 1)$ and G the solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t G(x, t) &= P \int_0^\infty N_\omega(z) [G(x+z) - G(x)] dz \\ G(\cdot, 0) &= \delta(\cdot - A) * \varphi_\kappa = \varphi_\kappa(x - A) \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

given by Proposition B.3, where P is a constant. Then for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$ one has

1. $\int_{-\infty}^{A-D} G(x, t) dx \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{D}\right)^\mu + C \frac{Pt}{D^\omega}$ for all $D > 0$ and
2. $\int_{A-2}^A |x - A| G(x, t) dx \leq C_\mu \kappa^\mu + C_\omega Pt$.

Proof. By shifting with A we can assume $A = 0$. Let $Z > 0$. Then testing equation (70) with $e^{Z(x-\kappa)}$ (note that this is possible as $\text{supp } G \subset (-\infty, \kappa]$) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx &= P \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^\infty N_\omega(y) [G(x+y) - G(x)] e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dy dx \\ &= P \int_0^\infty N_\omega(y) (e^{-Zy} - 1) dy \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx =: M_\omega(Z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_\kappa(x, 0) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_\kappa(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx.$$

Thus we obtain $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_\kappa(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx \exp(-t |M_\omega(Z)|)$. Estimating $M_\omega(Z)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |M_\omega(Z)| &\leq P \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-Zy}}{y^{1+\omega}} dy = -\frac{P}{\omega} \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-Zy}) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (y^{-\omega}) dy \\ &= \frac{PZ}{\omega} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-Zy}}{y^\omega} dy = \frac{PZ^\omega}{\omega} \int_0^\infty y^{-\omega} e^{-y} dy = P \frac{\Gamma(1-\omega)}{\omega} Z^\omega \\ &= CPZ^\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $G = 0$ on (κ, ∞) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} G(x, t) \left(1 - e^{Z(x-\kappa)}\right) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x, t) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\kappa}(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx \exp(-t |M_{\omega}(Z)|) \\ &\leq \left[\left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\kappa}(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx\right) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\kappa}(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx |M_{\omega}(Z)| t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [-\kappa, \kappa]$ we can estimate $e^{-2Z\kappa} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\kappa}(x) e^{Z(x-\kappa)} dx \leq 1$. Then choosing $Z = \frac{1}{D}$ and using also the estimate for M_{ω} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{-D} G(x, t) dx \leq \int_{-\infty}^{-D} G(x, t) \frac{1 - e^{\frac{x-\kappa}{D}}}{1 - e^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{D}}} dx \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} (\dots) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1-\frac{\kappa}{D}}} \left[\left(1 - e^{-\frac{2\kappa}{D}}\right) + CPt \frac{1}{D^{\omega}} \right] \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa}{D}\right)^{\mu} + C \frac{Pt}{D^{\omega}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the second part we use a dyadic decomposition and the estimate from the first part to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-2}^0 |x| G_{\kappa}(x, t) dx &= \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \int_{-2^{-n}}^{-2^{-(n+1)}} |x| G_{\kappa}(x, t) dx \leq C \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \left[\left(\frac{\kappa}{2^{n+1}}\right)^{\mu} + Pt 2^{\omega(n+1)} \right] \\ &= C \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} 2^{\mu} \kappa^{\mu} (2^{\mu-1})^n + 2^{\omega} Pt (2^{\omega-1})^n \leq C_{\mu} \kappa^{\mu} + C_{\omega} Pt. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now consider the situation of Proposition B.8 where the integral kernel is given as the sum of different kernels

Lemma B.11. *In the situation of Proposition B.8 with $n = 2$ one has*

1. $\int_{-\infty}^{A-D} G(x, t) dx \leq \int_{-\infty}^{A-D/2} G_1(x, t) dx + \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2} G_2(x, t) dx$
2. $\int_{A-1}^A |x - A| G(x, t) dx \leq \int_{A-1-\kappa}^{A+\kappa} |x - A| G_1(x) dx + \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} |x| G_2(x) dx.$

Proof. We consider again only the case $A = 0$, while the general result follows by shifting.

1. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{-D} G(x, t) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{(-\infty, -D]}(x+y) G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-\infty}^{-D-y} G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\ &= \int_{-\frac{D}{2}}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{-D-y} G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy + \int_{-\infty}^{-\frac{D}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{-D-y} G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\ &\leq \int_{-\frac{D}{2}}^{-\frac{D}{2}} G_1(x, t) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_2(y, t) dy + \int_{-\infty}^{-\frac{D}{2}} G_2(y, t) dy \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_1(x, t) dx \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2} G_1(x, t) dx + \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2} G_2(x, t) dx \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that G_i is normalized for $i = 1, 2$.

2. To prove the second estimate we first rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^0 |x| G(x, t) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{[-1, 0]}(x+y) |x+y| G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-1-y}^{-y} |x+y| G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} \int_{-1-y}^{-y} |x+y| G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $G_2 = 0$ on $\{y > \kappa\}$. Using also $G_1 = 0$ on $\{x > \kappa\}$ we have furthermore

$$\int_{-1}^0 |x| G(x, t) dx \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} \int_{-1-y}^{-y} |x+y| G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy.$$

Noting that for $y < -1 - \kappa$ we have $-1 - y > \kappa$ and thus the x -integral equal zero as $G_1 = 0$ on $\{x > \kappa\}$ we obtain (also using $-1 - \kappa \leq -1 - y$ for $y \in [-1 - \kappa, \kappa]$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^0 |x| G(x, t) dx &\leq \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} |x+y| G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\
&\leq \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} (|x| + |y|) G_1(x, t) G_2(y, t) dx dy \\
&\leq \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} |x| G_1(x, t) dx + \int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} |y| G_2(y, t) dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used $\int_{-1-\kappa}^{\kappa} G_i(x, t) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_i(x, t) dx = 1$.

□

Remark B.12. By induction we can prove the corresponding estimates for $n > 2$ with $D/2$ replaced by $D/2^{n-1}$ and κ replaced by $n\kappa$ (and of course summing over all G_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ on the right hand side).

References

- [1] D. J. Aldous, *Deterministic and stochastic models for coalescence (aggregation and coagulation): a review of the mean-field theory for probabilists*, Bernoulli **5** (1999), no. 1, 3–48. MR 1673235 (2001c:60153)
- [2] J. Cañizo and S. Mischler, *Regularity, asymptotic behavior and partial uniqueness for Smoluchowski's coagulation equation*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **27** (2011), no. 3, 503–564.
- [3] R.-L. Drake, *A general mathematical survey of the coagulation equation*, Topics in current aerosol research (part 2), International Reviews in Aerosol Physics and Chemistry, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1972, pp. 203–376.
- [4] M. Escobedo and S. Mischler, *Dust and self-similarity for the Smoluchowski coagulation equation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **23** (2006), no. 3, 331–362. MR 2217655 (2007a:82043)
- [5] M. Escobedo, S. Mischler, and M. Rodriguez Ricard, *On self-similarity and stationary problem for fragmentation and coagulation models*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **22** (2005), no. 1, 99–125. MR 2114413 (2006b:35034)
- [6] N. Fournier and P. Laurençot, *Existence of self-similar solutions to Smoluchowski's coagulation equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **256** (2005), no. 3, 589–609. MR 2161272 (2007a:82061)

- [7] ———, *Local properties of self-similar solutions to Smoluchowski's coagulation equation with sum kernels*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **136** (2006), no. 3, 485–508. MR 2227805 (2007f:45012)
- [8] I. M. Gamba, V. Panferov, and C. Villani, *On the Boltzmann equation for diffusively excited granular media*, Comm. Math. Phys. **246** (2004), no. 3, 503–541. MR 2053942 (2005b:82076)
- [9] G. Menon and R. L. Pego, *Approach to self-similarity in Smoluchowski's coagulation equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **57** (2004), no. 9, 1197–1232. MR 2059679 (2005i:82051)
- [10] B. Niethammer and J. J. L. Velázquez, *Self-similar solutions with fat tails for a coagulation equation with diagonal kernel*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), no. 9-10, 559–562. MR 2802924
- [11] B. Niethammer and J. J. L. Velázquez, *Self-similar solutions with fat tails for Smoluchowski's coagulation equation with locally bounded kernels*, Comm. Math. Phys. **318** (2013), 505–532.
- [12] ———, *Uniqueness of self-similar solutions to Smoluchowski's coagulation equations for kernels that are close to constant*, Journal of Statistical Physics **157** (2014), no. 1, 158–181.
- [13] M Smoluchowski, *Drei Vorträge über Diffusion, Brownsche Molekularbewegung und Koagulation von Kolloidteilchen*, Physik. Zeitschrift **17** (1916), 557–599.